

Classical Philology

VOLUME XX

April 1925

NUMBER 2

A FRAGMENT OF DEMOSTHENES' *THIRD* *PHILIPPIC* IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN COLLECTION

By J. G. WINTER

Among the papyri acquired by the University of Michigan in 1922 is a parchment fragment of a codex (numbered 918 in the Collection) consisting of a sheet of two leaves and containing Demosthenes' *Third Philippic*, sections 29-34 and 61 (in part)-68. It is declared to have been found at Akhmîm, the ancient Panopolis, in the *Thebais*. The dimensions of the fragment, which is in a single piece and in excellent preservation except for some worm-holes and discoloration by water in places, are about 21 centimeters in height by 32.5 centimeters in width. The page measurement is about 21 centimeters by 16.5 centimeters, and this was approximately the size of the original codex. The writing consists of two columns to a page; eight columns in all are therefore preserved in the manuscript. The individual columns have an average height of about 15.5 centimeters and a width of about 6 centimeters. There are twenty-seven lines in each column and an average of sixteen letters in the individual lines.

The first leaf (four columns) contains approximately the equivalent of forty-one lines of Butcher's text (Oxford); the second, of about thirty-eight lines. Each column therefore represents about ten lines of Butcher's text. On this basis we can determine the number of columns in the lost portion of the quire. From section 35 to the portion of section 61 where the text is resumed there are approximately

163 lines. The missing portion must therefore have contained sixteen columns, or two sheets of eight columns each, like the one before us.¹

Quires of three sheets are not unknown, but four was the more usual number and that was probably the case in this codex. If the quire consisted of four sheets, it is evident that one leaf, containing four columns, would have preceded section 29. The quire would then have begun approximately with section 24, and a concluding leaf, also of four columns, would have extended to about the beginning of section 74. Another column at least, possibly beginning a new quire, would have been necessary to account for the rest of the oration. It is also evident that sixteen columns would have sufficed to contain section 1 to the beginning of section 29. Assuming again that the quire was a quaternion, it is fair to conclude that the remaining sixteen columns were devoted to the end of another oration which preceded the *Third Philippic* in this codex.

Above the center of column ii is a symbol which I have not succeeded in deciphering, and above column iii is another which looks like $\iota\epsilon$, ιs , or a rudely formed κ ; both are inclosed by half-circles whose open side is toward the outer margin. They may be page numbers; if they are, a page numbered 10+ would indicate more pages in the codex than would suffice for the antecedent portion of the *Third Philippic* and not enough to include the whole of another oration.

Faint traces are left of the lateral page rulings, as also of the horizontal ones. The latter, it would seem, appeared for every third line. The horizontal rulings seem to be confined within the lateral ones and not to extend completely across the sheet. In general, the writer followed his rulings with care.

There are indications that the fragment in question formed part of a codex of some value. Not only the character of the text itself, as will appear later, but also the writing and the material used bear witness to an edition of Demosthenes that had been prepared with discrimination. The parchment is rather thin (.13 mm.) and, at present, rather brittle, with a fine, smooth surface. This is in itself a consideration of some importance in determining the date of the MS.²

¹ This estimate is confirmed by the Teubner text of Blass, 1903. Sections 29-34 = 44 lines, i.e., 11 lines per column. Sections 61-68 = 43 lines; 35-61 = 176 lines, or 16 columns.

² Cf. Thompson, *Palaeography*, p. 31.

The ink is dark brown faded to a lighter color in some places. Corrections made by a later hand are in black ink. The writing is a rather broad, upright uncial of medium size. The horizontal strokes of certain letters, especially tau and epsilon, show a tendency to end in ornamental dots. In general, the writing is somewhat larger and less precise than the fragment of Demosthenes shown in *Amherst Papyri*, Part II, Plate V, Number xxiv, and is somewhat smaller and neater than the hand shown in *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Volume VIII, Plate I, 1080, both of which are attributed to the fourth century A.D. We may therefore safely attribute the date of the Michigan fragment to the fourth century.

The text is of the "eclectic" variety made familiar by literary papyri; that is, it does not agree throughout with any particular codex or family of codices. That it belonged to the so-called longer redaction is evidenced by the presence of iii. 8-20; vi. 20; vii. 9-15.¹ The readings of S (or Σ), the tenth-century minuscule codex at Paris, by common consent the best MS of Demosthenes, are confirmed in several places against other MSS; but the same is true in case of some of the variants of MSS commonly regarded as inferior. In view of the general character of papyri-texts, and the Michigan parchment belongs to the papyri-tradition, it may well be asked whether scholars of the preceding generation have not attached far too much importance to the exclusive sanctity of one MS as compared to others.² It will appear, I believe, that the Michigan fragment represents a good text of the period; it would be useless to try to ascertain its precise place in the hypostasized *stemma*. That there was no standardized text of Demosthenes in the Roman period in Egypt is evident.

The fact that it is a good text is apparent from the following: in i. 15 M (Michigan) agrees with S and L¹ in omitting *δήπου* after *ἀγνοεῖ*; in i. 25 it agrees with S L A in omitting *τις* before *νῖος*; in ii. 6 it has *ἐνεῖναι* with S L A against *εἶναι* of other MSS; in ii. 13 M agrees with S L Y in omitting *πολλῆς* before *ὀργῆς*; in iv. 5 it agrees with S L A in reading *ὥσπερ* instead of the "vulgate" *ὅνπερ*; in v. 18 *καί* is read with S L Y; in v. 22 M agrees with S L A F in reading *τὸ* instead of *τοῦ*;

¹ Cf. Rehdantz-Blass, *Zusatz zur dritten philippischen Rede*; E. Drerup, *Antike Demosthenesausgaben*, *Philologus*, Supplementband, VII (1899), 538.

² Cf. Butcher, *Prefatio*, I, xi.

in vii. 16 it agrees with S L A in reading *μὲν* which others omit; in vii. 16 it agrees with S L in having *ὡς τὰ πράγματ'* omitting *ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι*; in vii. 17 we find *τεθνάναι δὲ* with S L instead of *γάρ*; in viii. 3 it agrees with S A in *τοὺς μὲν* but differs from them in having, with others, *ἡμετέρους* for *ὕμετέρους*; and finally in viii. 15 M agrees with S and all others in reading *τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐλπίζειν* instead of *ταῦτα ἐλπίσαι* of L, adopted by Blass.

Agreement with other MSS against S and sometimes L may be seen in the following: in ii. 14 *ἔφασαν* is read where S L have *ἔφησαν*; in iii. 21 M has *ὄντινα τρόπον χρῆ* with the "vulgate" where S L Y have *ὄν χρῆ τρόπον*; in iii. 26 *τῶν* of the codices is supported against *τὸν* of S L A; in iv. 5 M reads *οἱ* where S L¹ omit; in iv. 7 we find *μὲν* where S has *μή*; in iv. 21 *ἀφελόμενος* is read with many, which S L omit; in v. 6 *πόλεως δ'* is read with A Y against *δὲ πόλεως* of S L; in vi. 1 *έστιν* appears with A¹ F¹, which others omit; in vi. 19 M has *ἤδη*, while S L Y omit it; in vi. 20 there is agreement with A and others in having *καὶ ἐλύπουν οὐδέν* which S and others omit; in vi. 23 *προσῆσαν δ' ἀπέχθεται* is found in A and in the margin of S by a later hand; in vi. 25 M with various MSS has *οὔτε πρὸς χάριν οὔτε* against S B *οὐδὲ πρὸς χάριν οὐδὲ*; in vi. 27 M has the "vulgate" *προίεντο* where S L B V have *προσιέντο*; in vii. 7 M A have *λογιζόμενοι*, S L¹, etc., *ἐκλογιζόμενοι*; in vii. 8 M, with codices, has *ὕμιν*, S L *ἐν ὑμῖν*; in vii. 8 the passage *καὶ τοὺς . . . πόλιν* was added in S by a later hand, L F Y O do not have it; in vii. 20 M, with others, has *Φιλίππῳ*, where S¹ L¹ have *Φιλίππου*; in vii. 20 the passage *καὶ . . . τινά* is wanting in S and the first hand of L; and finally in viii. 27 M, with all except S L¹, has *συμβάντος τινός*.

Without taking into account elision, nu movable, and manifest errors in spelling, there are twelve instances of readings peculiar to M. These are ii. 5, *τούτων ταῦτ'*; ii. 9, *μηδὲν* for *μή*; ii. 12, *εἶναι*; iv. 8, *μή*; iv. 12, *καὶ οἱ Ἀμφικτῶνες*; iv. 18, *μὲν*; v. 10, *σώσαντας* where all texts have *σφύοντας*; v. 16, *ὅπως μή ζῶν λημφθῇ*; v. 19, *ὁσίως*, where all MSS read *καθαρῶς*; viii. 7, *μαστιγοῦμενοι καὶ στρεβλοῦμενοι καὶ σφαττόμενοι*, confirming Schaefer's conjecture; viii. 11, *Λασθένην*, where all MSS have *Λασθένη*, confirming Blass; and viii. 24, reading *ἄν* and omitting *ῆ*.

Marks of dieresis over iota and upsilon are everywhere by the first hand, as are the marks indicating elision. Punctuation is represented

by points in the high and middle position; discoloration and other causes make it difficult to determine whether or not all stops are by the first hand; most of them certainly are. Accents are not consistently employed; some are certainly in the original ink, others are not. Contraction by suspension of final nu at the end of a line occurs in i. 9; ii. 12; iii. 3; iii. 4; iv. 7; v. 4; vi. 16; vii. 21; viii. 13; viii. 25. All save one, viii. 13, *ἐκβαλὸς/των*, occur at the end of a word. Such contraction is indicated by a stroke over the final vowel. According to W. Crönert,¹ the earliest instance of this practice is to be found in the fragment of the *Third Philippic* 39-40, 43, *P. Fay.* 8, of the second century A.D.

In the transcription which follows I have adopted the practice of Grenfell and Hunt in the publication of literary texts in the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*.² Modern usage is followed in the separation of words and the employment of capitals in proper names. Smaller, thinner type indicates a correction by the first hand; thicker type, later correction. Square brackets [] indicate a *lacuna*, double brackets [[]] a deletion in the original. Dots under letters indicate letters so mutilated or blurred as to be doubtful. In supplementing *lacunae* I have followed Butcher's text with a view to affording a complete text, but it need hardly be added that the original text may have differed in these instances from the readings supplied.

COLUMN I

- | | | |
|-----|--|------|
| 1. | τον ανθρωπον περι
ρωμεν τον χρονο[ν κερ]
δαναι τουτον ον αλλος
απολλυται εκαστος ε | [29] |
| 5. | γνωκως ως γ εμοι δ[οκει]
ουχ οπως σωθησε[ται]
τα των Ελληνων σκο
πων ουδε πραττων
επει οτι γε ωσπερ πε | |
| 10. | ριοδος η καταβολη πυ
ρετου ή αλλου τινος
κακου και τωι πανυ πορ | |

¹ *Archiv*, II, 360.

² Cf., e.g., *Introductory Note on Method of Publication*, Vol. XV.

- ρω δοκουντι νυ[ν] αφε
σ[τ]αναι προσερχεται
15. ουδεις αγνοει και μην [30]
κακεινο γε ιστε οτι
οσα μεν υπο Λακεδαι
μονιων η υφ ημῶν επα
σχον οι Ελληνες αλλ ου
20. υπο γνησιων γε [ο]ν
[[ν]] των της Ελλαδος η
δικουντο και τον [αν]
τον τροπον αν τις υπε
λαβεν τουτο ωσπερ αν ει
35. υιος εν ουσίαι πολλη
γεγονως γνήσιος διώ
κει τι μη καλως μηδ' ορ

COLUMN II

1. θως κατ αυτο μ[εν του]
το αξιος μεμφεως ειναι
και κατηγοριας' ως δε
ου προσηκων η ως ου
5. κληρονομος τουτων
[[ων]] ταυτ' εποιει ουκ ε[[ν]]
νειναι λεγειν' ει δε γε [31]
δουλος η υποβολιμῆι
ος τα μηδεν προσηκον
10. τα απώλλυεν και ελυ
μαινετο Ηράκλεις ο
σω μάλλον ειναι δεινῶ
και οργης άξιον παν
τες αν εφασ[α]ν ειν[αι αλ]
15. λ' ουχ υπερ Φιλιππου κ
ων εκεινος πραττει
ουτως εχουσιν
νυν [[ουχ ουτω πραττου
σιν]] ου μονον ουχ Ελλη
νος όντος ουδε προσ
20. ηκοντος ουδεν τοις
Ελληνσιν αλλ' ουδε βαρ[βα]
ρου εντεύθεν οθεν

- καλον ειπεῖν ἀλλ' ὀλε
θρου Μακεδονος οθεν
25. ουδ' ἀνδράποδον σπου
δαῖον ουδεν ην προτε
ρον πριασθαι· καιτοι τι

COLUMN III

1. [της] εσχης ὕβρε[ω]ς ἀπο [32]
λεγει ου προς τωι πολεις
ἀνηρηκεναι τιθησι με
τα Πυθια τον κοινόν τῶ
5. Ἑλλήνων ἀγῶνα καν
αυτος μη παρη τους
δουλους ἀγωνοθετη[[σ]]
σοντας πεμπει κυριος
δε πυλων και των επι
10. τους Ἑλληνας παρόδων
εστιν και φρουραῖς και
ξενους τους τοπους [[το]]
τουτους κατεχει· εχει
[δ]ε και τ[ην] προμαντει
15. αν του θεου παρώσας
ημας και Θετταλους
και Δωριέας και τοὺς
αλλους Ἀμφικτυονας ἡς
ουδε τοις Ἑλλήσιν ἀπα
20. σι μέτεστιν· γραφει δε [33]
Θετταλοις οντινα τρο
πον χρη πολιτευεσθαι·
πεμπει δε ξενους τους
μεν εις Πορθμόν τον
25. δημον εκβαλοῦντας
των Ερετριέων τους δ'
επ Ωρεον τυραννον

COLUMN IV

1. Φιλιστειδην καταστη
[σο]ντας ἀλλ' ὁμως ταυθ'
ορωντες οι Ἕλληνες ἀνέ
χονται και τον αυτον

5. [τ]ροπον ὥσπερ οἱ τὴν χα
[λα]ζ'αν ἐμοίγε δοκουσιν
θεωρεῖν εὐχόμενοι με
καθ' εαυτοὺς ἕκαστοι μὴ
γενεσθαι κωλυεῖν δὲ
10. οὐδεὶς ἐπιχειρῶν· οὐ μο
νον δὲ ἐφ' οἷς ἡ Ἑλλάς [34]
ὑβρίζεται καὶ οἱ Ἀμφι
κτ[υο]νὲς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ [ο]ν
δει[s] ἀμυνεται ἀλλ' [ο]νδ'
15. ὑπερ ὧν αὐτὸς ἕκαστος
ἀδικεῖται· τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ
δὴ τούσχατόν ἐστιν· οὐ
Κορινθίων μὲν ἐπ' Ἀμ
βρακίαν ἐληλυθεν καὶ
20. [Λε]υκάδα· οὐκ Ἀχαιῶν
Ναύπακτον ἀφέλομε
[ν]ος ὁμῶμοκεν Διτωλοῖς
παραδῶσειν· οὐχὶ Θηβαί
[ω]ν Ἐχέϊνον ἀφηρηται
25. καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ Βυζαντίους
πορευεται συμμαχοὺς
ὄντας οὐχ ἡμῶν ἐὼ ταλ [35]

COLUMN V

1. ὄντος ρῆξαι φωνὴν [πριν] [61]
διασκευασμένοι π[ρος τα]
τειχὴ προσήεσα[ν οἱ πο]
λεμοὶ· τήνικαυτα δ' οἱ μὲ
5. ἡμυναντο οἱ δὲ προῦδι
δοσαν τῆς πόλεως δ' [ου] [62]
τῶς αλοῦσθης αἰσχροῦς καὶ
κακῶς οἱ με[ν] ἄρχουσι κ[αί]
τυραννοῦ[σι το]νς τότε σω
- α
10. σ[[ο]]ντας αὐτοὺς καὶ τὸν
Εὐφραῖον [ε]τοιμοὺς ὅτι
συ
[[ν]] ποιεῖν ὄντας τοὺς
μὲν ἐκβαλόντες τοὺς
δ' [ἀπο]κτείν[α]ντε[s] ὁ δ'

15. Ε[υ]φραιος εκεινος απέ
σφαξεν εαυτον οπως μη
ζων λημφθῇ εργω μαρ
τυρησας οτι και δικαιως
και οσιως ὑπερ των πο
20. λιτων αν'θις' τηκει Φι
λιππωι· τι ουν ποτ' αιτ[ιον] [63]
θαυμαζετε ἴσως το και
τους Ολυνθιους και τ[ο]υς
Ερετριεις και τους Ωρει
25. τας ἡδιον προς τους ὕ
περ Φιλιππου λεγοντας
εχειν η τους ὑπερ αὐτῶ·

COLUMN VI

1. οπερ κ[α]ι παρ ὕμιν εστιν
[οτι τ]οις μεν ὑπερ του
β[ε]λτιστου λ[ε]γουσιν ου
δε βουλομενοις ἐνεστι
5. ἐνίστε προς χαριν ου
δεν ειπειν· τα γαρ πρα
γματα αναγκη σκοπ[ειν]
οπως σωθησεται οι δ'
εν αυτοις δις χαριζονται
10. Φιλιππωι συμπραττον
σιν εισφερειν εκελευ [64]
εν δειν
ον οι δ' ουδ[ειν] εφασαν·
πολεμειν και μη πιστευ
ειν· οι δ' αγει[ν] ε[ρ]ηνην
15. εως εγκατε[λη]φθης[αν]
ταλλα τον αυτον τροπῶ
οιμαι πανθ' ἵνα μη κα
θ εκαστα λεγω· οι μεν
εφ οis ηδη χαριουνται
20. ταυτ' ελεγον και ελυπουγ
ουδεν· οι δ' εξ ων εμελ
λον σωθησεσθαι προ[σ]
ησαν δ' ἀπέχθειας πολ
λα δε και τα τελευταια

25. ουχ οὕτως οὐτε πρὸς
 χάριν οὐτε δι ἀγνοίαν
 οἱ πολλοὶ προΐεντο ἀλλ'

COLUMN VII

1. ὑποκ[α]τακλι[νομ]ῆνοι
 ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῖς ὁλο[ις] ἡττα]
 σθαι ἐν[ομι]ζον ο ρ[η] τον] [65]
 Δία καὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλω δε
 5. δοῦκα ἐγὼ μὴ παθῇθ'
 ὑμεῖς ἐπεὶ δὲ ἰδῆτε
 [λ]ογιζόμενοι μὴδεν
 ὑμῖν ἐνον· καὶ τοὺς
 εἰς τοῦθ' ὑπαγόντας
 10. ὑμᾶς ὁρῶν οὐκ ὄρω
 δῶ ἀλλὰ δυσωποῦμαι
 ἡ γὰρ ἐξεπίτηδες ἡ
 δι ἀγνοίαν εἰς χαλε
 πον πρᾶ[γ]μα ὑπαγού
 15. [σ]ι τῇν [πο]λιν· καί τοι μὴ
 γένοιτο μὲν ὦ τὰ πρᾶ
 γματ' ἐν τούτῳ· τεθνα
 ναι δὲ μυριακὶς κρείτ
 τον ἡ κολακείαι τι ποι
 20. ἦσαι Φιλιππῶι καὶ πρό
 ἔσθαι τῶν ὑπερ ὑμῶ
 αὐτῶν λεγόντων τι
 να· καλὴν γέ οἱ πολλοὶ
 νυν ἀπειληφασιν ὦρει
 25. τῶν χάριν ὅτι τοῖς Φιλιπ
 πῶι φίλοις ἐπέτρεψαν
 αὐτοὺς τὸν δ' Εὐφραι

COLUMN VIII

1. [ον] εὐθὺς καλὴν γέ ο [66]
 [δημ]ος ο Ερετριέων ὅτι
 [το]υς μὲν ἡμετέρους πρε
 α
 σβεις ἐπῆλασεν Κλειταρ

5. $\chi\omega\iota$ δε $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\upsilon$ $\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau[\omicron\upsilon\eta]$
 $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}[\epsilon]\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}$ γε $[\epsilon\upsilon]$ $\mu\alpha\sigma\tau[\iota]$
 $\gamma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\omicron\iota$ και $\sigma\tau\tau\epsilon\beta\lambda\omicron\upsilon$
 $\mu\epsilon\omicron\iota$ κ[αι] $\sigma\phi\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\mu\epsilon$
 $\nu\omicron\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\lambda\omega\varsigma$ $[\omicron\lambda\upsilon\eta]\theta\iota\omega\eta$ ε
10. ϕ $\iota\sigma[\tau]$ $\alpha\tau\omicron$ $\tau\omega[\nu]$ $\tau\omicron\eta\eta$ $\mu\epsilon\upsilon$
 $\Lambda\alpha\sigma\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$ $[\iota\pi]$ $\pi\alpha\rho\chi\omicron\eta$ $\chi\epsilon\iota$
 $\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\eta\eta\sigma\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\eta$ $\tau\omicron\eta$ $\delta\epsilon$
 $\Delta\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omega\eta\iota\delta\eta$ $\epsilon\kappa\beta\alpha\lambda\omicron$
 $\tau\omega[\nu]$ $\mu\omega\rho\iota\alpha[\iota]$ και $\kappa\alpha[\kappa\iota]\alpha[\iota]$ [67]
15. $\tau\alpha$ $\tau\omicron\iota\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ $\epsilon\lambda\pi\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota\eta$ και
 $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omega\varsigma$ $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\mu\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$
και $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon\eta$ $\acute{\omega}\eta$ $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\eta\kappa\epsilon\iota$
 $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\eta$ $\epsilon\theta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\eta\tau\alpha\varsigma$ $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$
 $\tau\omega\eta$ $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho$ $\tau\omega\eta$ $\epsilon\chi\theta\rho\omega\eta$
20. $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\eta\tau\omega\eta$ $\alpha\kappa\rho\omega\mu\epsilon$
 $\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\tau\eta\lambda\iota\kappa\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\eta$ $\eta\gamma\epsilon\iota$
 $\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ $\pi\omicron\lambda\iota\eta$ $\omicron\iota\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta$ $\tau\omicron$ $\mu\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$
 $[\theta]\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon$ $\mu\eta\delta'$ $\omicron\tau\iota\omicron\upsilon\eta$
 $\alpha\eta$ $\delta\epsilon\iota\eta\eta$ $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$
25. και $\mu\eta\eta$ $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\eta\eta$ γε $\alpha\iota\sigma\chi\rho\acute{\omicron}$ [68]
 $\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\eta$ $\pi\omicron\tau'$ $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\iota\eta$ $\sigma\upsilon\mu$
 $\beta\alpha\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\iota\eta\omicron\varsigma$ $\gamma\alpha\rho$ $\alpha\eta$ ω

In the following commentary, the readings attributed to S are taken from Omont's facsimile;¹ readings recorded by other MSS are taken from the editions of Butcher (Oxford, 1903, abbreviated as B.), Blass (Teubner, 1903=Bl.), and Rehdantz-Blass (Leipzig, 1905=R-Bl.). Minor variants, such as those arising from the use, or the neglect, of elision and nu movable, will not be noticed.

COLUMN I

2. $\kappa\epsilon\rho\delta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\iota$ is found in all codices. Bl. prints $\kappa\epsilon\rho\delta\eta\eta\alpha\iota$.
3. The breathing of $\delta\eta$ is in the brown ink of the first hand.
11. The breathing of η seems to be in the original ink.
15. M agrees with S and the first hand of L in omitting $\delta\eta\pi\omicron\upsilon$ after $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\eta\omicron\epsilon\acute{\iota}$.

¹ *Demosthenis Orationum Codex Σ*, Vol. I. Paris: Leroux, 1892.

16. The breathing of $\delta\tau\iota$ seems to be in paler ink.
18. The breathing of η is by the first hand. The original reading $\ddot{\upsilon}\phi\omega\nu$ was corrected, apparently by a later hand. The accent is original.
20. $\gamma\epsilon$ is followed by a hole with room for two or three letters, and ν extends beyond the lateral ruling. It is in brown ink but paler, perhaps from blotting, and seems to have been added after the initial ν of 21 had been marked for deletion. There is a contraction stroke extending into the margin, which would seem to show that the original reading was $ο\ddot{\upsilon}$ (= $ο\ddot{\upsilon}\nu$), repeated by mistake from the end of the preceding line. The contraction stroke is crossed out in brown ink.
25. M agrees with S L A in omitting $\tau\iota\varsigma$ before $\nu\iota\delta\varsigma$. The accent of $ο\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota$ is in paler brown ink.
26. The accent of $\gamma\eta\gamma\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is in paler ink.
26. The accent of $\delta\iota\acute{\omega}\kappa\epsilon\iota$ is in paler ink. S has $\delta\iota\acute{\omega}\kappa\epsilon\iota$.

COLUMN II

1. Bl. brackets $\kappa\alpha\tau'$.
2. All codices have $\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\omicron\varsigma$. B., Bl., R-Bl., print $\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\omicron\nu$ after Ald. Bl. omits $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$.
3. The punctuation is by the first hand.
5. All MSS read $\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\tau\omega\nu\ \acute{\omega}\nu\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau'$. In M $\acute{\omega}\nu$ (with pale-brown accent) was written by the first hand and then, for some erroneous reason, was crossed out, apparently by the first hand.
6. The ν of $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$ was crossed out by the first hand at the end of 6 and prefixed to 7. The reading is that of S L A against $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$ of the lesser MSS.
7. The punctuation is by the first hand.
8. The breathing of η is original. Bl. with A² omits. The accent of $\acute{\iota}\pi\omicron\beta\omicron\lambda\iota\mu\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ is original and placed over the first vowel of the diphthong.
9. M alone reads $\mu\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu$; others $\mu\eta$.
10. $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\omega}\lambda\lambda\upsilon\epsilon\nu$ has the paler accent.
11. The accent of $\text{'}\text{Η}\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ is in paler ink.
12. The accent of $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu$, covering both α and λ , is original. M alone has $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$.
13. M agrees with S L Y in omitting $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\eta\varsigma$ before $\acute{\omicron}\rho\gamma\eta\varsigma$. $\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\omicron\nu$ is accented in paler ink.

14. S L have *ἔφησαν*, others *ἔφασαν*. The scribe wrote *εἶναι*, then *ι* was added, apparently later in paler ink, by crowding it beside *ε*.
15. For some reason which cannot be determined because of the hole at the end of 14, *λ* was added in the margin of 15. It is like the writing of the first hand but in paler ink. The *κ* at the end of the line is unmistakable although not completely preserved. There is no room for *καὶ*.
17. The first hand wrote *οὐχ οὕτω πραττου/σιν*. The corrector drew a line through the phrase, wrongly including *οὐχ*, and added deletion dots over *σιν*. *οὕτως ἐχουσιν* was written above in blacker ink and in a different hand.
19. *δντος* has an accent in paler ink.
22. Bl. reads *βαρβάρων*. The accent of *ἐντεῦθεν* is in paler ink.
23. The accent of *εἰπεῖν* is in paler ink.
25. *ἀνδράποδον* seems to have been accented by the first hand.
26. The accent of *σπουδαῖον* is original, covering the diphthong.
27. *πριασθαι* is omitted by the first hands of S and L but added by later. R-Bl. omits; Bl. (on the basis of Lucian *Paras.* 42) reads *πρίαυτό τις ἂν ποτε*. The punctuation is by the first hand.

COLUMN III

1. The correction of *εσχης* to *εσχαιης* is by the first hand.
3. S reads *ἀνηρηκέναι*. The upper part of *ε* at the line's end is gone but there is no sign of final *ν*; we are therefore warranted in assuming the presence of an original sign of contraction.
4. The accent of *κοινόν* is probably by the first hand.
6. S has *παρήι*.
7. The correction in syllabication is by a later hand.
8. The passage *κύριος δὲ . . . μέρεσιν* is omitted by the first hand of S and L; in S it was added in the upper margin by a later hand. This is a part of the longer redaction.
10. The accent of *παρόδων* is original.
11. The accent of *φρουραῖς* is original, covering the diphthong.
12. The deletion of *το* at the end of the line is by the first hand.
13. The punctuation is by the first hand.
15. The accent of *παρώσας* is probably original. A watermark has defaced the text.

17. Δωριέας, τοὺς have original accents.
18. The breathing of ἡς is in the original ink.
20. The punctuation is original. The accent is in paler ink.
21. M here agrees with various codices in reading *ὄντινα*. S L Y have *ὄν*, and the order *ὄν χρη τρόπον*.
22. The accent of *χρη* (read *χρη*) and the punctuation are by the first hand.
24. Πόρθμον was written; the grave accent was crossed out by a later hand and an acute placed on the *ultima*.
25. The accent of *ἐκβαλόντας* covers the diphthong and is in paler ink.
26. S L A read *τὸν* instead of *τῶν* of various codices. The accent of *Ἑρετρίων* is original.

COLUMN IV

1. Read Φιλιστίδην.
3. The accent seems original.
5. M agrees with S L A in reading *ὥσπερ* instead of *ὄνπερ* of the codices. The breathing is in paler ink. M agrees with codices in reading *οἱ*; S and the first hand of L omit.
7. The accent of *θεωρεῖν* covering both letters of the diphthong is in paler ink. *εὐχόμενοι* has the paler accent. M has *μὲν*; S, *μὴ*.
8. The breathing of *ἔκαστοι* is in paler ink. M seems alone in reading *μὴ* at this point. It has the appearance of having been added by the first hand after he realized its omission following *μὲν* in the line above.
10. The accent of *ἐπιχειρῶν* is in paler ink; the stop is original. Under the concluding letters *ου μο* is a stroke in the original brown ink, which ends in the margin in a sort of long-hand English *f* with the final horizontal stroke ending in a descending loop. Its meaning is not clear; it does not represent the paragraph sign, although a paragraph begins here, because paragraphs are not indicated in this MS, and if they were, we should look for the symbol in the left, not the right, margin.
11. The breathing of *ἡ* is in paler ink.
12. *καὶ οἱ Ἀμφικτύονες* is not found elsewhere.
15. The breathing of *ὦν* is in paler ink.
16. The accent of *ἀδικεῖται*, in paler ink, covers the diphthong. The punctuation is original.

17. In *τοῦσχατόν ἐστιν*, the accents are in paler ink. The punctuation is original.
18. *μέν* is not recorded elsewhere.
20. The punctuation is original.
21. *Ναύπακτον* has the paler accent. *ἀφελόμενος* does not appear in S and L but occurs elsewhere.
22. *ὁμώμοκεν* has the paler accent.
23. The punctuation seems original.
24. Read *Ἐχλῖνον*; the accent is in paler ink. S has *ἀφήρηται*.
27. *ἔω* has the paler accent.

COLUMN V

1. The opening letters form part of *προσιόντος* (B., 61, l. 13).
2. *διασκενασμενοι*, which does not appear elsewhere, is probably an uncorrected error for *διασκενασάμενοι*.
3. B. prints *προσῆσαν* and Bl. *προσῆσαν*; S agrees with M. The accent is in later ink.
4. The stop in the middle position seems to be original.
5. Read *ἡμύνοντο*.
6. *πόλεως δ'* A Y; *δὲ πόλεως* S L vulgate. B., Bl., and R-Bl. print the former.
7. The accent of *ἀλούσης* is later.
8. *ἄρχουσι* has the later accent.
9. The accent of *τότε* is later.
10. The scribe wrote *σώσοντας*; the correction was made by a later hand, the ink being black. Codices read *σφζοντας*.
11. The breathing of *Εὐφραῖον*, roughly resembling an acute accent, is by a later hand (cf. vii. 27). The breathing of *ὅτι* is later.
12. *ου* is a later correction over a reading which it is difficult to determine on account of a perforation. It may have been *υν*.
14. The accent of *ἀποκτείναντες* is later.
15. *ἀπέσφαξεν* has the later accent.
16. The phrase *ὅπως μὴ ζῶν λημφθῇ* does not occur elsewhere. The spelling *λημφθῇ* (= *ληφθῇ*) is common in papyri. The accent seems later.
18. M has *καὶ* with S L Y; others omit.
19. M alone has *ὁσίως*; others, *καθαρῶς*.

20. ἀνθιστήκει was marked for correction to ἀνθεισθήκει but none was made.
21. The high stop is in the original ink. A, τὸ αἴτιον.
22. M has τὸ with S L A F instead of vulgate τοῦ.
24. Read Ἐπεριέας. S agrees with M in spelling.
25. ἡδίων has later breathing.
27. ἀντῶν, the breathing, late, is over the first letter. The punctuation is in the middle position.

COLUMN VI

1. M has ἐστιν only; A F νῦν ἐστιν.
4. The accent of ἐνεστί is later.
5. ἐνιότε has the later accent.
6. The punctuation is original. The α of τὰ seems to have been re-touched by a later hand.
9. The breathing of οἷς is later.
12. οὐδεὶν was corrected by a later hand to οὐδεν δειν. The punctuation is by the first hand.
14. The punctuation is by the first hand.
15. The lacuna may of course have held λει with S Vind. i.
18. The punctuation seems to be by the first hand.
19. ἡδη is not found in S L Y Vat. P.
19. χαριοῦνται has the later accent extending over the diphthong.
20. M agrees with A and other MSS in reading καὶ ἐλύπον οὐδέν.
21. The stop is in the middle position and may be later.
22. A S (in margin by a later hand) and others add προσῆσαν δ' ἀπέχθεται. The accent of προσῆσαν like that of ἀπέχθεται (23) is later.
25. L has πρὸς χάριν οὐδὲ (adopted by B. and Bl., who, however, brackets πρὸς χάριν); S B corr. have οὐδὲ πρὸς χάριν οὐδὲ; others, with which M agrees, οὔτε πρὸς χάριν οὔτε.
27. S L B V. i have προσίεντο; others, προίεντο; still others, προίεντο ἐαυτούς.

COLUMN VII

6. Read εἰδῆτε; the spot is discolored and it is impossible to determine whether a correction was made.

7. S L have ἐκλογιζόμενοι; A, λογιζόμενοι; vulgate, ἐκ λογισμοῦ. The lacuna in M can have held only one letter.
8. S L have ἐν ὑμῖν; vulgate, ὑμῖν, with which M agrees. There are marks in black ink which resemble grave accents over *ενον*; they are probably accidental or meaningless. The stop, in the middle position, seems to be later.

The passage *καὶ τοὺς . . . πόλιν*, evidence of the longer redaction, appears in the margin of S by a later hand; it is not found in L F Y O. Bl. remarks: "*quae quamvis sint numero Demosthenico composita, tamen hoc loco a Demosthene nunquam profecto scripta sunt.*"

10. The accents are later. The breathing is later.
11. The accents are later.
12. The accents are later.
15. The stop is in the middle position and seems later.
16. O Vind. i omit μὲν; it appears in S A L. M agrees with S and L in reading *ὡς τὰ πράγματ'*. In M ω was corrected to ως by adding s above in the first hand. B. does not record this variant, printing, as does Bl., *ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι*.
17. The stop is in the middle position and may be later.
18. S L A have τεθνάναι δέ; others γάρ.
19. The accent of *κολακεῖα* is in a later hand.
20. The first hands of S and L have Φιλίππου; others Φιλίππῳ. In S ω was later added over ου.
The passage *καὶ . . . τινά* (not *τινάς* as in B. and Bl.) is wanting in S and the first hand of L. *προέσθαι* has later acute accents over both of the first two vowels.
23. The stop is probably original.
25. The accent of *᾽Ωρειῶν* is later.
27. *Εὐφραῖον* has a breathing similar to that of v. 11.

COLUMN VIII

2. The accent of *᾽Ερετριέων* is in paler ink.
3. M agrees with S A in reading *τοὺς μὲν* but differs from them in having *ἡμετέρους* for *ὑμετέρους* with others. Confusion between the possessives is not uncommon in papyri.

4. The first hand wrote ἀπήλασεν; a later hand wrote ε over α without deleting the latter.
6. The accents and correction of δουλείουσί are by a later hand. εν was crossed out by a later hand.
7. The accent in 7 is later. The combination of participles caused trouble early. S has μαστιγούμενοι καὶ σφαττόμενοι with which L A agree. In S στρεβλούμενοι, the vulgate variant for σφαττόμενοι, is added above the line by a later hand. M supports Schaefer's conjecture of μαστιγούμενοι καὶ στρεβλούμενοι καὶ σφαττόμενοι.
9. ἐφίστατο was corrected by a later hand to ἐφέισατο.
11. All codices read Λασθένη, which Bl. corrects to Λασθένην. This is confirmed by M, which has the addition, by a later hand, of ν above. The accent is later.
13. This line affords the only example of contraction by suspension which does not end a word.
14. μωριαὶ and κακιαὶ were corrected by a later hand.
15. L alone reads ταῦτα ἐλπίσαι, which Bl. adopts.
17. The breathing of ὦν is later.
22. The accent of οἴκεῖν seems later.
24. M alone has ἄν in this position; it is probably due to the scribe's carelessness. The accent of πείσεσθαι is later, the punctuation original.
27. S and the first hand of L alone omit συμβάντος τινός. ἄν has the later accent.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

THE INTIMATE RELATION BETWEEN ECONOMIC
AND POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN HISTORY, AS
ILLUSTRATED IN ANCIENT MEGARA

BY A. A. TREVER

Historians have been slow to apply the principle of the unity of history in a truly synthetic historiography. The very process of investigation to determine the facts often causes the historian to see them only as isolated phenomena instead of in their actual relations. We are still prone to think naïvely of facts as existing externally and independent of the human mind, as being something apart from their meaning, or as having meaning apart from other facts. We still indulge in false distinctions between the alleged "solid facts" and the "mere theory," as if our so-called fact could possibly be separated from some theory or interpretation of it. In our very specialization on one phase of history, also, we become so engrossed with one group of facts that we frequently overlook its essential relation to other groups. The resulting impression produced on the reader is thus too often that of a history divided into closed compartments, entirely lacking in genetic connection between its political, economic, and cultural aspects. A real synthesis of all phases of life in any period, revealing clearly their mutual relations and reactions upon each other, is still comparatively rare.

It is the purpose of this article to attempt such a synthetic picture of the political, economic, and social life in the little city-state of Megara, during the seventh and sixth centuries before Christ—its colonial activity, industrial and commercial development, interstate relations, internal politics, social strife, and the natural reaction of these upon one another.¹ The early history of Megara will also be presented as a typical example of the striking economic and political transitions that characterized the eastern Mediterranean world during the Greek Middle Ages. A synthetic study of conditions in one of the

¹ There is practically no data on the cultural life of Megara, except the little that may be inferred from the elegies of Theognis.

smallest Greek states, in this early period, has the advantage of simplicity. The facts and their meaning for history will stand out clearly. However, the meagerness and confusion of the data render impossible fulness of detail. One must thus constantly guard against substituting fancy for authority and inferring too much from the data, the besetting sins of ancient historians and archaeologists alike.

It is a commonplace of Greek history that the seventh and sixth centuries before Christ were marked by notable economic advance and social and political storm and stress throughout the Greek world. Hellenic civilization was in its formative period. The age was coincident with the most active era of Greek colonization. Miletus, Phocæa, Chalcis, Eretria, Corinth, and Megara vied with each other in establishing new outposts of civilization, until the entire circle of shore from Crimea to the Pillars of Hercules, from Thrace to Africa, was dotted with Greek cities. The "inhospitable" became the "hospitable" sea,¹ the Thracian peninsula, "New Chalcis,"² South Italy, a larger Greece. Massilia was established in the Far West; the thriving ports of Naucratis and Cyrene were planted on the African shore; barbarous West Greece was successfully colonized from Corcyra; and even the Pillars of Hercules were passed, and Spanish Tartessus was discovered on the Atlantic Coast.³

The period was characterized by increasing and more definite knowledge of geography,⁴ a great extension of agriculture though with slight improvement in agricultural methods,⁵ the development of private tenure,⁶ a new industrial activity, an adventurous spirit in shipping, a marked advance in commerce in raw materials and products of industry between the colonies and the mother-cities, the in-

¹ εἰξενος for ἄξενος. Pindar *Pyth.* iv. 361 still uses ἄξενος in his story of Jason, but the legend calls for it.

² The common term by Herodotus' day, vii. 185, χαλκιδικὸν γένος.

³ *Hdt.* i. 163, by Phocæans on the lower Guadalquivir, probably in the early sixth century; iv. 152, Samians are driven there by contrary winds, and find Greek traders had preceded them.

⁴ Aside from the evidence of colonization, this is reflected in the literature. Cf. the *Homeric Ship Catalogue*, probably produced in this period, and *Homeric Hymn to Delian Apollo*, 30 ff.

⁵ G. Glotz, *Le Travail dans la Grèce Ancienne* (1920), pp. 80 ff.

⁶ Hesiod *Erga* 37; 341; cf. P. Guiraud, *La Propriété foncière en Grèce jusqu'à la Conquête Romaine*, I (1893), chap. vi; cf. A. A. Trever, "The Age of Hesiod," *Classical Philology* (April, 1924), pp. 157 f. and notes.

vention and expanding use of money, increase in population and in the number and size of cities, a steady increase in wealth and luxury, the beginning of a grain problem in some of the Greek states, the rise of an ignoble capitalist class, the shifting of the basis of aristocratic special privilege from birth to wealth and from wealth exclusively in land to commercial wealth, the tendency for the nobles and wealthier commercial classes to unite their interests politically and by intermarriage, and a growing gulf between the privileged classes and the oppressed peasantry.¹ These marked economic and social changes are intimately associated everywhere in the Greek world with revolutionary transition from aristocracy to tyranny and democracy, and these revolutions are usually accompanied by increasing partisanship, class bitterness, confiscations, exiles, and massacres of either party. We shall find many of these tendencies illustrated in the history of ancient Megara.

Megara, like Corinth, was very limited in territory, with poor, stony soil, and devoid of other natural resources. Isocrates says, with characteristic rhetorical exaggeration, that the Megarians had neither land nor silver mines nor harbors, and that they farmed rocks.² Their land was fitted for little but grazing, and this could be pursued only on a very small scale. Doubtless Megara early failed to raise sufficient grain to feed her population. Her poor soil, her limited territory, her early industrial development, her interest in the Pontic grain trade, all bear witness to this. Her active colonization is also clear evidence that her population problem was beginning to be acute even in the seventh century. As early as the latter eighth century, therefore, she began to emphasize industry and trade, which, according to later evidence, furnished employment for a large part of her population. She became famous for the manufacture of rough woollens and large earthenware vessels.³ The coarse quality of these products

¹ For detailed data on the foregoing, cf. E. Meyer, *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 81 ff.; Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte*, I, 384-509; Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, I (2d ed., 1912), I, chaps. ix and x, all probably overdrawing the extent of capitalistic development.

² *Peace* (8). 117, καὶ γῆν μὲν οὐκ ἔχοντες οὐδὲ λιμένας οὐδ' ἀργυρεῖα, πέτρας δὲ γεωποιούμεναι. But Megara seems to have exported vegetables, *Athen.* vii. 13; i. 49.

³ *Xen. Mem.*, ii. 7. 3; *Aristoph. Acharn.* 519; *Peace* 1002; *Athen.* i. 49 f.; cf. Busolt, *op. cit.*, I, 471, n. 1; Bluemner, *Gewerbliche Thätigkeit der Völker des klassischen Altertums*, p. 71; Buechsenschuets, *Die Hauptstaette des Gewerbfleisses*, XVI, 71, 89.

proves that Megarian culture was lacking in the great characteristics of the Greek genius, especially in that artistic talent and pride in fine workmanship which marked even the common artisan in Athens. These manufactures of Megara were produced either by individual artisans or in very small shops, and probably largely by free labor, until well into the fifth century. However, we have here an actual export industry, which doubtless developed at an early date. The later utter dependence of Megara upon industry and commerce is evident from the economic straits to which she was reduced by the Athenian embargo during the first half of the Peloponnesian War.¹

Megara was very well situated for the development of commerce. She was on the direct route of all land trade from North Greece to the Peloponnesus. She faced both east and west, having a harbor on the Corinthian Gulf at Pagae and on the Saronic Gulf at Nisea. During her most prosperous period also, she commanded the entire entrance to the Saronic Gulf by the possession of the island of Salamis.

It is thus not surprising that this little state was one of the pioneers in colonization both in the east and west. The dominating motive at first, as in other Greek states, was probably the pressure of population and the need for more arable land. Her very meager natural resources brought on this crisis early in Megara, but primitive methods of cultivation and family land tenure aggravated the situation, as elsewhere. Of course, in addition to land hunger, a complex of motives was active from the first, such as the desire for trade and the spirit of adventure. Political and social revolution, however, was a later factor.²

One of the earliest Greek settlements in Sicily was Hyblean Megara, probably dating from the opening of the seventh century. A considerably later colony of Megara in the west was Selinus.³ She was also not far behind Miletus in the east, with colonies at Astacus, Chalcedon, Byzantium, Heraclea, and Bithynian Selymbria before the middle of the seventh century.⁴ It is indeed hardly probable that

¹ Thuc. i. 42. 67; Aristoph. *Acharn.* 729 ff.

² Glotz, *op. cit.*, pp. 120 ff.

³ Thuc. vi. 4 and 5; Polyaeus v. 5; Diod. xiii. 62. There are practically no contemporary sources for Greek colonization.

⁴ *Hdt.* iv. 144 calls them blind for choosing the site of Chalcedon before Byzantium. Strabo vii. 320; xii. 563; Arrian *Periplus* xiii. 3; Xen. *Anab.* vi. 2. 1; Ephorus frag. 83. For complete ancient data on Megarian colonies in the East, cf. Busolt, *op. cit.*, I, 42 f. and notes.

Miletus had colonized to any extent on the shores of the Pontus before the enterprise and farsightedness of Megarian seamen had founded Byzantium at the entrance to the Bosphorus. Of course, these early pioneers appreciated only slightly the strategic importance of the Golden Horn as a site for a colony, but through it, Megara long dominated the trade of the Pontus. The colony became wealthy through her tax on imports, especially on grain, and through her tunny fisheries. The mother-city imported from the Pontic region grain, timber, wool, metals, and hides, and sent in return her heavy potteries and her coarse woollens. The simultaneous development of agriculture and trade through colonization gave a new impetus to Megarian industry, as the colonists needed her large jars as containers for their agricultural products, and her rough textiles. Her growing industry, in turn, stimulated trade and the development of a city economy. Her possession of the gateway to the Bosphorus, and the growing demand for Pontic grain in Greece probably enabled her to dominate largely this import during the seventh and sixth centuries.¹

However, it is easy to exaggerate the extent of Megarian trade and export industry in this early period by reading modern meanings into the terms used. It is still a mooted question whether Megara coined her own money until the middle of the fourth century. If the older view of Head is correct, that she did not, it should warn us against overestimating her early economic importance. There are no coins extant that can be assigned to Megara with any assurance before the later date, but Percy Gardner is probably correct in his statement:

It is scarcely to be supposed that Megara, the outpost of the Dorians against Athens, and a colonizing city in the seventh century B.C., should have been without coins, when Aegina, Corinth, and Athens, her neighbors, were all using them.

This is also substantially the view of Babelon. Both are inclined to follow Svoronos in assigning the ancient coins with the radiate wheel as a symbol of the sun-god to Megara.² In any event, Miletus, Corinth, and Chalcis were doubtless more important commercially than

¹ Cf. Droysen, *Athen und der Westen* (1882), p. 41.

² The whole problem of the Megarian coinage and the origin of her standard admits of no dogmatic settlement from present data. Head, *Hist. Numm.*, p. 329; Svoronos, *Jour. Int. d'Archeol. Numism.* (1898), p. 273; Gardner, *History of Ancient Coinage*, pp. 131 f.; Babelon, *Traité des Monnaies Grecques et Romaines*, III (1914), 146-50.

Megara in the seventh century, and Aegina and Athens soon became so in the sixth century. The lack of resources must have hampered her severely in her competition with all of these states. From the time of the Persian wars, her prosperity and independence were constantly threatened by her geographical situation between two jealous and more powerful neighbors, Athens and Corinth. After the fall of Athens in 404 B.C., she had a breathing space, and after the Peace of Antalcidas, in 387 B.C., which assured her freedom, she coined money. She profited by the rivalry of Athens, Sparta, and Thebes, and began to show something of her ancient commercial prosperity.¹

An interesting evidence of the increasing dominance of commercial interests in the Greek world in general, and in Megara in particular, during the seventh and sixth centuries, is the development of interstate alliances and hostilities motivated largely by economic considerations. The most striking example of this, in the seventh century, was the so-called Lelantian War. Beginning as a mere boundary dispute between Chalcis and Eretria, it spread over all Greece, and became largely a commercial war. Commercial interests broke old ties of relationship. Dorian Corinth was an ally of Ionian Chalcis and Samos, while Dorian Megara and Aegina, as competitors of Corinth, were allies of Ionian Eretria and Miletus. Sybaris in Italy was friendly to Eretria. Croton, her neighbor and enemy, therefore, espoused the cause of Chalcis. Theognis, 891-94, probably refers to this war, and the part of Corinth under the Cypselids in it, and this, if correct, would serve to fix the approximate date as between 655 and 581 B.C. Since Chalcis won, if Corinth was allied to her and Megara was opposed, this would give a reason for the wail of Theognis over the lack of valor of Megara, and for his bitterness against the Cypselids of Corinth. There was also probably some connection between this victory of the Cypselids and the internal revolution in Megara.² Since

¹ On the prosperity of Megara before 338, cf. Isoc. *Peace* (8). 117, *μεγίστους οίκους τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐκτείνονται*; though his picture is colored by rhetorical exaggeration. Specific mention of trade and industry by Theognis in the sixth century is rare, though it is not to be expected in poems of this nature. Cf. 1166, *ἐμπορίην*; 179 f., where he advises seeking on the sea escape from harsh poverty; 677-80, the metaphor of a ship; *φορτηγῶν*, 679, may mean "merchant seamen" or "menials on shipboard," but the genuineness of the whole passage is very doubtful. All references to Theognis are to the Hudson Williams edition of 1910.

² Thuc. i. 15. 3, *καὶ τὸ ἄλλο Ἑλληνικὸν ἐς ξυμμαχίαν ἑκατέρων διέστη*. *Hdt.* vi. 21, Miletus and Sybaris; *ibid.* v. 99, Miletus and Samos; Strabo, x. 448. 465. On

there were repeated outbreaks of this war, the reference of Theognis may well be to the final struggle in the sixth century.

Harrison, in his *Studies in Theognis*,¹ denies the general importance or the commercial character of the Lelantian War. He objects to the usual interpretation of Thucydides as referring to a naval war or as intending to include all the leading states of Greece, and on the basis of the silence of Thucydides and Herodotus, he denies the active participation of Corinth and Megara. He therefore questions the emendation of Theognis, 891-94, cited above, and, in any event, doubts its reference to the Cypselidae of Corinth. But the *animus* of his entire argument is to avoid an early date for Theognis, and he fails to suggest any better interpretation for the passage. It must be admitted that the specific ancient authority for the activity of Megara and Corinth is weak, but the language of Thucydides certainly cannot refer to a mere local or land war, and on any natural interpretation would include the leading states of Greece. Since he generalizes, and names no state, there is no basis for an argument from silence here. The fact, on the other hand, that Herodotus names only Samos and Miletus has no weight against including Corinth and Megara, since he is discussing the Ionian revolt, and is interested only in the Ionian states involved. His reference to the Lelantian War is only incidental to explain the aid of Eretria to Miletus in the Ionian revolt. Moreover, the fact that he does name Miletus and Samos as having part in the Lelantian War proves that it was neither merely a local nor a land war. Of course, the actual sea fighting was probably not so very extensive. Thucydides himself places the first naval battle in 664 B.C. between Corinth and Coreyra, but he also refers to warships built by a Corinthian for Samos, which Busolt plausibly thinks may have been for the Lelantian War.²

these alliances, cf. E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, II, 537 ff.; Busolt, *op. cit.*, I, 220, n. 3; 456 f. and notes; Hermann, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, pp. 189-200, who argues plausibly for repeated conflicts; Holm, *Curtius Aufsaetze*, p. 29, on the influence of the war in the West; Pauly-Wissowa, art. "Chalcis," on Megara and Corinth in the war; Beloch, I, 1, 339, n. 1; Costanzi, *La Guerra Lelantea, Atene e Roma* (1902), pp. 769 ff., a thorough and interesting study, skeptical of the older view. The emendation of Κυφελιδων, Theognis 891-94, for the impossible Κυφελλιδων is generally accepted, and the genuineness of the passage is usually unquestioned. It reads as follows: οἱμοι ἀναλκις ἀπὸ μὲν Κήρυκος δλωλεν || Ἀηλάντου δ' ἀγαθὸν κείρεται οἰνόπεδον || οἱ δ' ἀγαθὸι φεύγουσι, πόλιν δὲ κακοὶ διέκουσιν. ὥς δὲ Κυφελιδων Ζεὺς σέλεσε γένος.

¹ Pp. 286, 294.

² i. 13. 4; i. 13. 3. Busolt, *op. cit.*, I, 546, n. 1.

Another example of the intimate connection between economic interest and interstate relations is the long struggle of Megara and Athens for the island of Salamis, and especially for leadership in the trade of the Pontus. Athens developed late in trade and industry, since she had more extensive land for agriculture than Megara and Corinth, and since she was not situated directly on the coast. She had taken no part in the active colonization of the seventh century. Her conflict of interests with Megara, therefore, probably did not begin much before the close of that century. The tradition is badly confused, but from that time the two states seem to have had repeated struggles for the island. The possession of Salamis determined which should dominate the Saronic Gulf, and therefore which should govern the trade of the other. A glance at the map of Greece will reveal at once the strategic importance of Salamis to both states. It holds the key to both Athens and Nisea, as well as the key to the bay. Whichever state held it would be a constant menace to the other, and the defeated state was fated to economic and political decadence. The island was also valuable to either state as an aid to the solution of the grain problem and as a means of relief for social tension through colonization. Salamis thus presents, on a miniature scale, the age-long problem of commercial competition as the primary cause of international warfare. The problem reappears in ever widening scope in the contest of Athens versus Aegina, Athens versus Corinth, Ptolemaic Egypt versus Seleucid Syria, Rome versus Carthage, England versus Spain, England versus Holland, England versus France, England versus the German Empire. Its field has gradually expanded from the Saronic Gulf to the Aegean, to the entire Mediterranean, to the Atlantic, until its present center is the Pacific, and it relates to all the strategic waterways of the civilized world. But though it has now become practically infinite in its complexity and threatens to engulf civilization, unless solved, it still presents many of the same elements that were active in the simple conflict of Athens and Megara over the control of the Saronic Gulf.

An occasion for hostilities was probably furnished by the fact that Theagenes, the tyrant of Megara, aided Cylon, his son-in-law, in his attack on Athens in 632 B.C. Later, Megarian ships attacked the coast of Attica; and Athens, in turn, made an unsuccessful attempt on

Salamis and Nisea, both of which Megara continued to hold.¹ The Athenians finally became weary of repeated hostilities, and decreed that any motion to open the war for Salamis again would be punished by death. Tradition tells that Solon therefore feigned madness, and appeared in the market place, reproaching Athens for abandoning Salamis, and urging her to renew her fight for it. The law was repealed, and Solon was given command. One tradition states that he gained the island by a ruse, and that Pisistratus accompanied him. Another states that he seized it by a night attack, and makes no mention of Pisistratus. The latter is doubtless correct, as Plutarch is inclined to believe.²

In the confusion of party strife, after Solon's reforms, Megara seems to have regained Salamis. Later, as the prelude to his tyranny, Pisistratus renewed the attack, gained Nisea, which through the arbitrament of Sparta, was exchanged for Salamis.³ From this time on, Megara was permanently weakened through the fast-growing power and resources of Athens, and through her own interminable civic strife. Henceforth, Athens held the island and dominated the gulf. She sent a company of her citizens to Salamis as cleruchs, and set up a stone pillar bearing a decree as to the administration of her new territory.⁴

But the occasion for hostilities between Megara and Athens was by no means limited to the question of Salamis and the Bay of Eleusis. Athens was playing for the larger stake of the Megarian Pontic trade,

¹ Thuc. i. 126; *Hdt.* v. 71; Plut. *Solon* 12, *allos*, indicates that Salamis had previously been held by Athens for a time. The same is evident from 8 and 9, otherwise Solon's complaint would not be so bitter.

² Plut. *op. cit.* 8 and 9. There is nothing inherently improbable in the story of Solon's conquest provided we follow this latter tradition. Cf. also, Paus. i. 40. 5; Solon's fragment, Bergk, *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*, II, 1-3. For the view that Solon's conquest is unhistoric, and that the story is based merely on his elegy, cf. Beloch, *op. cit.*, I, 2, 310-12.

³ *Hdt.* i. 59; Ar. *Ath. Pol.* xiv. 1; Plut. *op. cit.* x. The bitterness of the struggle is revealed in the *Homeric Ship Catalogue*, where Salamis is represented as belonging to Athens at the time of the Trojan War, *Iliad* ii. 508. Strabo ix. 394 quotes a tradition that either Solon or Pisistratus inserted this in order to influence the decision in favor of Athens.

⁴ Hicks and Hill, No. 4, the earliest extant decree of the Athenian people. Its date is between 570-560. Cf. Wilhelm, *Attische Mitteilungen* (1899), pp. 466 ff.; Wilamowitz, *Aristoteles und Athen*, I, 267 f., on the date of the conquest.

especially the grain trade. This was not merely commercial ambition on the part of either, but also the growing economic necessity of securing access to a sufficient grain supply. From the beginning of the sixth century, Megarian control of the grain trade from the Pontus must have been felt more and more keenly as an obstacle in the way of Athenian development. This was especially so as Athens became more active in industry and commerce, as her population rapidly increased, and her native grain product decreased through the development of olive culture.¹

Over a generation before Pisistratus' tyranny, Athens had seized the fort of Sigeum at the entrance to the Hellespont.² In the confusion of party strife at home, she seems to have lost it. In any event, Pisistratus recaptured it, and considered it of sufficient importance to establish one of his sons as governor there.³ Some years later, under his tyranny, Athens sent out Miltiades to establish a colony in the Thracian Chersonese where he became a tyrant and upheld Athenian influence.⁴ By the latter half of the sixth century, then, Megara was beginning to be out of the race for the domination of the Pontus, and her competitor, Athens, was soon destined to take the place of her own ally, Miletus, in this region. Megara's final loss of Salamis and domination of the Pontic trade was a double blow to her prestige, and her commercial prosperity dwindled to insignificance until the fourth century. However, she was still able to send twenty ships to Artemisium and Salamis, and three thousand men to Platea in the Persian crisis.⁵

¹ On the early grain problem in Athens, cf. Plut. *op. cit.* 24, Solon's prohibition of export of all agricultural products except oil, despite the fact that the price of grain was ruinously low and needed the stimulus of export trade. Cf., also, Droysen, *op. cit.*, pp. 41 ff., Grundy, *Thucydides and the History of His Age*, pp. 66 f., pressing overmuch Plut. *op. cit.* 22 and 24; Zimmern, *Greek Commonwealth*, p. 347; Wilamowitz, *Philologische Untersuchungen*, I, *Nachtraege*, p. 213, 17, n. 25. The fact that Athens did not colonize, however, is strong evidence that her grain problem was not unduly pressing in the seventh and sixth centuries.

² *CIG.* 8. The Attic dialect and alphabet shows that Athens dominated Sigeum in the early sixth century.

³ *Hdt.* v. 94 f.; cf. E. Meyer, *op. cit.*, II, 661, and Beloch, *op. cit.*, I, 2, 312, on this; cf. Strabo xiii. 1. 38.

⁴ *Hdt.* vi. 34-40.

⁵ *Ibid.* viii. 45; ix. 28.

The intimate relation between economic and political conditions is still more evident in the social and political revolutions of early Megara. Her tragic internal history presents a striking example of what was a commonplace in the Greece of that day. Athens also had her experience of social discontent and tyranny during the sixth century, but she escaped the worst through the wise measures of Solon, Pisistratus, and Cleisthenes. Megara, on the other hand, was permanently weakened. In addition to her poverty in resources and her unfortunate situation between the more powerful Athens and Corinth, civic strife must be reckoned as one of the most important factors in her economic and political decline.

Internal dissension began in Megara at least by the middle of the seventh century, and continued throughout the sixth and later.¹ The Doric noble landholders were at first the leaders in commerce and colonization. In the course of the economic transition, however, an increasing number of commons became wealthy through trade. The port of Nisea became more populous with a new and growing class of industrials and merchants of common ancestry, who gradually gained considerable well-being and importance in the city. Thus the basis of nobility began early to shift from birth to wealth, and from wealth in land merely, so as to include movable property. The narrow Doric landed aristocracy was thus being undermined at its very foundations by the economic changes.² But while it lasted, it was extremely exclusive and oppressive, and the new opportunities for the indefinite increase of wealth and luxury and the free play of selfish individualism and insatiate greed made it increasingly so. The inequalities thus became ever more glaring.

At the other end of the social scale were the oppressed peasant cultivators and herdsmen, the mass of the people, utterly dependent upon the nobles, and very wretched.³ If there were any small land-owners, they were hard pressed by the poverty of the soil, low prices,

¹ Cf. Strabo ix. 1. 18, *πολλαῖς δὲ κέχρηται μεταβολαῖς ἡ τῶν Μεγαρέων πόλις*; E. Meyer, *op. cit.*, II, 39, and note; on the general subject of the political and social revolutions in Megara, cf. S. de Martiis Cognetti, *Socialismo Antico* (1889), pp. 497-508; cf. F. Cauer, *Parteien und Politiker in Megara und Athen.*, 1890, somewhat overdrawn, but suggestive.

² Busolt, *op. cit.*, I, 670; Theognis constantly harps on the dominance of the ignoble wealthy in the sixth century, 185 ff., 149 f., 315, 1117 f., 683, etc.

³ Theognis 53 ff. cited below.

lack of sufficient coinage, and the pinch that always comes to the lower classes in a swift economic transition. The increasing number of small artisans, city workers, and sailor folk doubtless helped to swell the discontented classes, and the ignoble but prosperous commercials, who were still excluded from political privileges, were ready also to lend their influence to effect a revolution. The stage was thus well set in the latter half of the seventh century for some ambitious leader to espouse their cause, overthrow the narrow oligarchy, and make himself tyrant.

That man was Theagenes. He first aroused the enthusiastic following of the peasants by slaughtering the cattle of the nobles, and thus rode to power on a wave of popular favor and hate of the nobles. He was also backed by the city workers, and probably, at first, by the more prosperous commons.¹ In accord with the usual policy of Greek tyrants of encouraging the establishment of tyrannies in other states, he was aided in his *coup* by Cypselus, of Corinth. Little is known of his tyranny, except his connection with the Cylon affair and his later war with Athens. He built a fine aqueduct, following the recognized policy of tyrants of encouraging public works as a monument of their power, and as a means of employing the poor at the expense of the rich.² He probably ruled not more than ten years. He alienated the wealthy commons by his exploitations, who soon united with the nobles, their old enemies, and overthrew him.³ Thus, under the pressure of the tyranny, the old aristocratic exclusiveness broke down, and not only alliance but intermarriage of the wealthy commercials with the nobles became common. Money was king. The old aristocracy was being transformed into a plutocracy.⁴

The fact that the new basis of special privilege was broader, and that the masses had already given evidence of their power, probably made the new aristocracy rule more moderately at first. There was a

¹ His tyranny began before 632, as he aided Cylon in his *coup* on Athens. Cf. *Ar. Pol.* v. 5. 1305-1305a 24 f.; *Rhet.* i. 2. 7. 1357b; Beloch, *op. cit.*, I, 1, 369 f., thinks that the nobles were overthrown because of the failure of the war against Athens, but this would mean too late a date for the tyranny.

² Paus. i. 40. 1; 41. 2.

³ Plut. *Hellenika* 18.

⁴ Cf. the bitter complaints of Theognis, *infra*, p. 128, n. 1. He belonged to the old exclusive party of nobles who opposed intermarriage.

brief respite from strife,¹ but renewed oppression again drove the masses to revolution, and under the lead of demagogues, they initiated a reign of terror. To paraphrase Plutarch's figure of Plato, the demagogues as cupbearers poured out for the masses an unmixed draught of freedom. Completely corrupted by their leaders, the poor violently attacked the rich, and entering their houses, they demanded elaborate entertainment there, threatening with extremes of violence and insolence all who dared to oppose.² Theognis deplores the sufferings of his party, and complains that the poor no longer pay interest on their debts, and plunder the houses and even the temples.³ The mob kept exiling many of the rich nobles and commons, confiscated their property, and relieved the condition of the peasant cultivators by forcing the creditors to refund the interest previously paid them.⁴ The peasants also seem to have gained citizenship and admission to the assembly.⁵

Aristotle uses this violence of the masses in Megara to illustrate the way in which democracy may overreach itself, and thus may be overthrown as a result of its disorder and anarchy.⁶ The example is well chosen, for after years of bitterest strife and anarchy, the wealthy nobles and commons in exile became so numerous that they returned in force and regained the power.⁷ A new constitution was drafted, in which political rights were granted to all who had helped to restore the exiles.⁸ Thus once more, through the struggle, as well as through

¹ Plut. *Hellenika* 18.

² *Ibid.*, εἴτα πολλὴν κατὰ Πλάτωνα καὶ ἄκρατον αὐτοῖς ἐλευθερίαν τῶν δημαγωγῶν οἰσχοομένων διαφθαρόντας παντάπασι τὰ ἄλλα τοῖς πλουσίοις ἀσελγῶς, προσεφέροντο, καὶ παρίοντες εἰς τὰς οἰκίας αὐτῶν οἱ πένητες ἤξιον ἐστᾶσθαι καὶ δειπνεῖν πολυτελῶς, εἰ δὲ μὴ τυγχάνουσιν, πρὸς βίαν καὶ μετ' ὕβρεως ἔχρωντο πᾶσι.

³ Cf. n. 4, *infra*.

⁴ Ar. *Pol.* v. 5. 1304b 34 ff.; Plut. *Hellenika* 18. πάλιντοκίαν. The language of Aristotle would imply that the exiling was done gradually. Welcker's inference that the land had been previously re-divided is based on a misinterpretation of *δαμοῦς*, 678, which has no relation to γῆς ἀναδαμοῦς.

⁵ Theognis 53 ff., οἱ προσθ' οὔτε δίκας ἤδεσαν οὔτε νόμους || ἄλλ' ἀμφὶ πλευραῖσι δορὰς αἰγῶν κατέτριβον || ἔξω δ' ὄσθ' ἑλαφοὶ τῆς δ' ἐνέμοντο πόλεως |·| καὶ νῦν εἰς ἀγαθοί. From this passage, it would seem that Theagenes' tyranny had brought little permanent benefit to the peasants.

⁶ *Pol.* v. 3. 1302b 30 f.

⁷ *Ibid.* v. 5. 1304b 34 ff., cited above, n. 40.

⁸ Ar. *Pol.* iv. 15. 1300a 17 f.

the economic transition, the distinction of noble birth was being obliterated, and noble and new rich alike were allied against the common enemy.

This disintegration of the old stock was bitterly opposed by some of the narrower nobles like Theognis. He complains that a noble does not hesitate to marry a woman of ignoble birth, provided she has money, and that a noble woman prefers wealth to noble descent in a husband. All give money the place of honor. Wealth has mixed the race, and it is now hopelessly decadent.¹

We know not how long this alliance of nobles and new rich retained the power, but the bitter strife continued at intervals throughout the century and longer. The democracy must have been in power from 459-446 B.C., during the alliance of Megara with Athens. Thucydides speaks of democratic conditions in Megara at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War. As late as 424 B.C., even in the face of desperate conditions resulting from the embargo of Athens, there was a democratic revolution, followed by an oligarchic reaction, accompanied with the usual partisan treachery, exiles, and massacres.² Thus Megara was ever less able to withstand the domination of either Athens or Corinth. The oligarchs and democrats were each willing to sell the liberties of their country for partisan advantage, an attitude which was only too characteristic in most of the Greek states, and which was largely responsible for the tragic failure of Greek politics.

In view of Megara's checkered history to the end of the fifth century, it is interesting to find Isocrates (*Peace* 117) using her as a model of independence, prosperity, and peace within herself and outside. The implied secret of her alleged happy condition is, forsooth, that she has *σωφροσύνη* instead of *ὑβρις* and *ἀκολασία*. Of course, the age of Isocrates was a time of comparative peace and prosperity for Megara, but still one is led to exclaim: "O Rhetoric, what sins against History are committed in thy name!"

The elegies of Theognis are our chief source for knowledge of conditions in Megara during the first half of the sixth century. He was a Megarian noble who flourished about the middle of the century.³

¹ 185 ff., *πλοῦτος ἐμξε γένος*; 305-8.

² Thuc. iv. 66-74. Cf. Hudson Williams, *Elegies of Theognis*, p. 9, on this passage.

³ On the vexed problem of the date and native land of Theognis, cf. Harrison, *Studies in Theognis*, pp. 268-305, and Hudson Williams, *op. cit.*, pp. 4-12, where all

The elegies are so broken, incoherent, and interpolated, and it is so difficult to be sure of the genuine *Theognidea*, that it is impossible to give a detailed picture of the course of events. However, the general outline is fairly clear, and agrees well with the account presented above.¹ He lived when the bitterness was most acute, and the degenerating effect of the long strife was already in evidence. In addition to his hardships caused by the revolution, loss of property, and exile, he had been betrayed by one of his own friends.² Wealth cuts him, though once an old acquaintance.³ He is extremely bitter, and hopes later to drink the blood of his enemies.⁴ His elegies reflect well the economic stress and the resulting political anarchy, the sudden shifts

ancient data and the opinions of modern scholars are cited and discussed. Their decision for Nisean, instead of Sicilian Megara as his birthplace, accords well with the internal evidence of the elegies, and is in agreement with the verdict of most modern scholars, except Beloch and Unger. About the only ancient evidence to the contrary is Plato *Laus* 630A.

Harrison places the poet in the latter half of the sixth century, while Williams makes him an old man by 545 B.C. The weight of the argument points to the latter date. The conclusion hinges largely upon the question of the genuineness of Theognis 757-68 and 773-82, and on the interpretation of *σπαρὸν ὑβριστὴν Μήδων* in the latter elegy, if genuine. Williams, pp. 9 f., is probably right in doubting the genuineness of the first passage, and in interpreting the spirit of both as better fitting an earlier fear of the Medes in 545 B.C.

¹ Cf. Harrison's criticism of Flach and Sitzler, *op. cit.*, pp. 302 f., for their fanciful attempt to reconstruct the history in detail. On the genuineness of the *Theognidea*, cf. Harrison, *op. cit.*, pp. 100-267, for a review and criticism of scholarly opinion to 1902. He represents a conservative reaction from the extreme views of Sitzler and Reitzenstein. He would retain nearly all, even the erotic elegies of Book ii, and he asserts that our edition is practically that used by Theognis. Hudson Williams, *op. cit.* (1910), pp. 12-82, represents a later, more moderate view which is probably nearer the truth. He rejects Book ii and Harrison's fanciful theory of repetitions. He accepts the name, *Κύπρις*, as the seal of genuineness wherever it occurs, and contends that Book i contains no poem later than the age of Theognis, though some are earlier. He is probably right also in accepting some of the elegies as genuine, which have not the seal. Franz Wendorff, *Die aristokratischen Sprecher der Theognis Sammlung*, 1909, on the other hand, would make Theognis a mere shadow, and argues that the elegies are by a considerable number of Spartan aristocrats. I have largely followed Williams' judgment as to the genuine Theognis passages in my citations.

² Theognis 667 ff. Cf. Williams, *op. cit.*, pp. 34 and 218, on these lines, which are often ascribed to Evenus, a contemporary of Socrates. But the general situation is similar to that in 53-60, which are of undoubted genuineness, and the whole accords well with the social and political conditions of Theognis' day, as also with the personal poetry of the poet. Cf. 262-66.

³ *Ibid.* 667-69, *νῦν δέ με (χρήματα) γνώσκοντα παρέχεται*. The neuter plural may be derogatory for the personal.

⁴ *Ibid.* 349, *τῶν εἴη μέλαν αἶμα πτεῖν*.

of fortune, and the exploitation of the nobles by the rebellious masses.¹ The poor man suddenly becomes very rich, and he who had great possessions loses them all in one night. All things are topsy turvy. The stupid gain glory and the ignoble win honor.² The state is torn by rebellion, and is in danger of shipwreck.³ Confiscations, sedition, violence, insolence, fratricidal strife, are common.⁴ The formerly noble, *ἀγαθοί*, have become the ignoble, *κακοί*, and the base-born are now the noble.⁵ All the gods are gone but hope; the race of pious men is dead; no one now reveres the gods.⁶

Like the other early aristocratic Greek poets, epic and lyric, Theognis constantly uses *ἀγαθός*, *κακός*, and words of similar meaning with a political instead of a moral connotation. To him, the "good" are regularly the noble born, and the "bad" are all other classes, even though wealthy. There is, however, some connection with a kind of moral excellence in the background of his thought. He is aristocrat enough to believe that a man cannot have genuine personal excellence on any other basis than by the claim of birth. The conduct and character of the new rich and of the vulgar masses in rebellion doubtless furnished him with plenty of reasons for his prejudice. This use of terms in a non-moral sense which later came to have a distinctly moral meaning is an interesting example of the way in which the evolution of ethics is revealed in the history of language.⁷

Though Theognis is so thorough an aristocrat, and constantly contrasts the low-born with the nobles, he rebukes the common spirit of class greed in both parties.⁸ He prefers the golden mean and a life free from injustice.⁹

¹ Theognis, 51 f., *στάσις τε καὶ ἐμφυλίου φόνοι ἀνδρῶν*. 78, *διχοστασίη*; 53 ff.; 345 f. and 825-32, he is stripped violently of his property by enemies; 157 f., 355, 655 f., on the sudden shift of fortunes.

² *Ibid.* 661-66.

⁵ *Ibid.* 57-60 (1109-14).

³ Cf. above p. 129, n. 2.

⁶ *Ibid.* 1135-50.

⁴ *Ibid.* 43-52, 835, 1081-82b (39-42).

⁷ Cf. *ibid.* 53-60, 523-26, 893, 972, 1109-14, 1117 f., 23-38, 69-72, 82, 105-12, 166, 289-92. 593 f. and 613 f. may have a moral connotation. Cf. 149 f. for a possible moral connotation of *παγκακῶ* and *ἀπερίης*. 315-18, a fragment of Solon, has a distinctly moral meaning. Cf. Grote, *History of Greece*, III, 2, 45, n. 3, on Welcker's discussion of "good" and "bad" as used by Theognis and other Greek writers.

⁸ Theognis 199-201, 225, 401-6, 466, a common theme for poets before and after Theognis. *κέρδος* and its compounds are frequent—86, 133, and the other citations in this note. The very search for gain, *κέρδος διζήμενος*, tends to make men unjust—145 f., 751 f., 753, 29 f.

⁹ *Ibid.* 129 f., 145 f., 559 f., 753, 1153 f., 1155 f., 1230.

The great prominence given to wealth in his elegies is a clear evidence of the commercial and industrial activity of sixth-century Megara. Wealth makes the man. Plutus is the fairest and most to be desired of all the gods.¹ The rich man is universally honored.² Wealth has supreme power.³ It means many friends while poverty means few friends, regardless of the personal character.⁴ Only the rich are mourned in their decease.⁵ Wealth has no limit.⁶ Poverty empties life of its value, and is to be shunned as the greatest evil.⁷ The intense feeling of the poet for the humiliation of poverty and the power of wealth clearly shows that the anarchic revolution of the peasants has not dethroned wealth as king, but that it has merely resulted in a violent redistribution of wealth.

The history of Megara in the seventh and sixth centuries is thus typical of that in the other Greek states, as regards industrial and commercial development, political revolutions, civic strife, social bitterness, and anarchy and the intimate relation of economic interests to political changes, interstate alliances, and wars. Her wars with Athens for commercial dominance, her part in the general Lelantian War of the Hellenic states, her fratricidal strife and social anarchy, are all ominous prophecies of her later decadence, as indeed of the final political, economic, and cultural decline of all the Greek city-states. They all gradually decay through bitter class struggle for economic advantage in each state, as well as through the larger uncompromising struggle between the states for political and economic dominance in the Hellenic world. Even states of far greater natural wealth must have succumbed eventually to such exhausting conditions. When we consider the pitifully meager resources and the hand-to-mouth economic policy of even the best of the Greek states, and especially of Megara, the marvel is that they were able to stand the double strain of constant civic strife and interstate war so long.⁸

¹ *Ibid.* 1117 f.

² *Ibid.* 718.

³ *Ibid.* 931 f.

⁴ *Ibid.* 621 f., 699 ff.

⁵ *Ibid.* 928-30.

⁶ *Ibid.* 227-29, a fragment of Solon, xiii. 71-76, but probably very expressive of the attitude of Theognis as it is so characteristic of Greek thought; 1157-59.

⁷ *Ibid.* 181 f., 267-70, 173 ff., 351 f., 393 ff., 523-26, 621 f.

⁸ The remarkable virility of these petty Greek states despite conditions is well illustrated in the revival of Megara in the fourth century.

As the world has become larger, the stakes vaster, and the problem infinitely more complex, the interclass and international strife has grown apace. For though history never repeats itself in detail, economic changes react today in about the same way, only more disastrously, on the same selfish human nature. Whether class or state, it still keeps its eye on the main chance, and lets the devil take the hindmost. There is still with us the same blind conservatism of class privilege, the same threat of revolution by the embittered ignorant masses, the same strife for economic advantage, the same aggressive competition of states for commercial supremacy, the same readiness of the stronger to crush the weaker, the same failure to co-operate, and to put the highest interests of civilization first. The stage and the actors are changed, and the drama is vastly more complex. The petty farce of the Greek city-states seems puerile beside it. But the principles involved, the ambitions and impulses, the causes of the strife, and the devastating results are similar in essence. The destructive effects are merely greater in proportion to the vastness of the game, both in home and foreign affairs. The simpler Hellenic story and its sequel may well serve as a clear warning to the modern world to choose the high way of co-operation in industry and international relations, instead of the blind alley of partisan class strife and international anarchy.

LAURENCE COLLEGE

EPIGRAPHICAL NOTES

BY CARL D. BUCK

During my stay in Greece as the annual professor in the American School of Classical Studies at Athens for the year 1923-24 I have taken the opportunity to examine the originals of many archaic and dialectic inscriptions. In the majority of cases this has served merely to satisfy my curiosity and confirm previous readings, without yielding anything calling for publication. Some observations which seemed worth recording are included in the following notes, which however are only partly concerned with questions of reading. The references in the captions, for purposes of identification, are where possible to the collections, rather than to the special articles. "Ditt." refers to the third edition of Dittenberger's *Sylloge*, and "Schwyzer" to the new revision of Cauer's *Delectus*.

1. The Xuthias bronze. IG. V. 2. 159. Ditt. 1213. SGDI. 4598. Roberts 257. Schwyzer 57. Buck 65.

The most recent of the numerous discussions of this inscription is that of Comparetti, *Annuario*, II, 247 ff., with exhaustive comment on the character of the document and the reading of the intentionally mutilated face A. To begin with the question of reading, it must be stated that the photograph of A is published in such a form (*colla scrittura ripassata e rilevata*, p. 265) as to rob it of its purely objective character. The designer has brought out, with a distinctness startling to one acquainted with the original, the faint outlines which he saw or believed he saw on the plate. In some critical cases these are not the same which I either see plainly or believe I see on the original bronze, which I have examined at length and repeatedly, and under the best conditions of light.

The uncertain readings, as is well known, are in line 2 and in lines 5, 6. In line 2 Meister's reading αἰ κ' αὐτὸς ἐι, ἱτῶ, ἀνελέσ/θῶ, repeated in the collections cited above, awakens serious misgivings which Comparetti is not the first to express (cf. *SGDI* iv. p. 681). After ΑΙΚ the ΑΥΤΟΞ, though faint, is certain, so that there is no possibility of

reading αἷ κα ζῶε, as some have wished to do. The letters between αὐτός and ἀνελέσθω are read ΕΙΙΤΟ by Meister and also by Comparetti (pp. 248, 266), who after ridiculing Meister's ἔι, ἱτῶ, himself assumes an engraver's error for ΒΙΟΙΤΟ! In spite of the agreement in the reading ΕΙΙΤΟ, I do not trust it. At one angle one seems to recognize outlines which at another angle vanish and are replaced by others. I can see what has been taken as O, which however would have to have its lower part a horizontal line, but again I seem to see quite plainly the outlines of a rather tall E. For the letter preceding, I can see what has been taken for T, but again at another angle the outlines of a K. The preceding letter is l. In the space before that, where Meister and Comparetti read ΕΙ and Eustratiadis Η, I conjecture Η or Θ (the latter form possibly at the beginning of l. 5, as read by Comparetti). The reading which I then suggest tentatively, in the belief that it is at least equally justified by the faint outlines on the bronze and distinctly more satisfactory otherwise than previous readings, is ΗΙΚΕ or ΘΙΚΕ, subjunctive of ἵκω, with the third singular in -ε, in contrast to ἀποθάνει of the next line, but like ζῶε of B, due to the Tegean engraver. The sentence will read then αἷ κ' αὐτός ἵκῃ, ἀνελέσθω, "If he comes himself, let him take it."

In lines 5, 6, the usually accepted reading of the whole clause (so Meister, and in all the collections cited above) is αἱ δὲ κα μὲ γένετα/ι τέκνα, τῶν ἐπιδικατῶν ἔμεν. But τέκνα involves a violent correction. The first editor, Eustratiadis, read ΓΕΤΝΕΤΟΝ, which with a slight correction he took as πεντ' ἐτῶν. Comparetti reads the same letters, but still accepts Meister's correction. "ΓΕΤΝΕΤΟΝ è chiara e non dubbio lezione secondo il fascimile. L'artefice che poco prima avea segnato πέντε φέρεα, spropositando a suo modo, segnò qui insensamente πεντερον invece di ι τεκνατον Fuor di dubbio è però che si debba correggere e leggere τέκνα τῶν ἐπιδικατῶν come il Meister e poi ogni altro ha letto e come il senso assolutamente richiede" (p. 244). "Chiarissimo ΓΕΤΝΕ come nel fcl. invece di ΤΕΚΝΑ che non sappiamo come mai il Meister possa aver veduto nella sua fot. usando, come noi, la lente" (p. 266). According to my own observation, the letters ΓΕΤ are clear, the next following is not N, but A, which I see plainly when holding the bronze at a certain angle to the light. In the next place I can see what has been taken as the faint outlines of E, but the only certain

part is the lower half of the vertical, so that | is a possible reading, and as I think the correct one. The letters at the end of line 5 with the first of line 6 have been universally understood as γένετ'αι, and so likewise by Comparetti in spite of his observation (p. 266): "*In fin di linea la fot. rivela lo stranissimo errore AA per TA, cioè il T omissso e l' A incompletamente ripetuto.*" The letter following CENE is in fact plainly A, followed by faint outlines which look like Λ, and there is space for one more letter (for some of the lines, as 1 and 2, run close to the margin). Instead of assuming here with Comparetti the *stranissimo errore* and the still more remarkable one in line 6, I read the whole clause, with the same general sense but without correction of the text, as follows: αὶ δὲ κα μὲ γενεὴ λ[ε]/ἰπῆται τῶν ἐπιδικατῶν ἔμειν.

In his discussion of the subject-matter, Comparetti begins by assailing the obstinacy of previous commentators in regarding the inscription as Laconian, or at least as not Arcadian, and commends Hiller von Gärtrigen for having at last put it in its proper place among the Arcadian inscriptions. "*E così per assai anni questa sfortunata epigrafe andò vagando fuori del suo luogo natio, finchè di recente fu finalmente con giusta sensatezza dall' Hiller v. G. rimessa al posto che le compete nelle IG., cioè fra le arcadiche, tegeatiche.*" Hiller does not deserve this doubtful credit, for he has simply followed the practice of the IG in placing the inscription with the others found at Tegea, and he expressly notes: "*Arcadum dialectum nisi in minoribus quibusdam scribendi modis [K. Meister alii] in censum non venire iam constat.*" This note states correctly the opinion of all dialectologists, who will hardly adopt Comparetti's invitation to them (p. 257) to accept the inscription as Arcadian and study it as such. For he is under a singular delusion in supposing that they have reasoned merely from the absence of certain Arcadian characteristics and that no one has pointed out forms which could not be expected in Arcadian. On the contrary, αὶ, τοί, the infinitive in -μεν, the numerals in -καταί, and ἡξῶντι are all positive evidence against the Arcadian dialect. The dialect is plainly Doric, and, while certain special peculiarities of Laconian are not observed, the probability is still that the foreign depositor was from the neighboring Laconia (cf. *Athen.* vi. 233), as long since maintained by Kirchhoff. Comparetti attributes the alleged errors of all previous commentators to their failure to recognize that the author-

ship rests not with Xuthias but with the Arcadian temple officials. It is true that the temple officials are the authors, in a technical sense, of what is virtually an acknowledgment of deposit from Xuthias and agreement to dispose of it according to certain instructions. But the instructions were of course formulated by Xuthias, and the officials in this case kept the Doric form.

Even the generally accepted view that face A was canceled on the occasion of a second deposit which raised the total amount to 400 minae is contested by Comparetti on the ground that there was room to add a statement of the alleged second deposit below on the same face. But what more natural than that Xuthias at the later date wished to amplify his instructions and requested the temple officials to cancel A and replace it by a new agreement B? Instead of this Comparetti believes that A was canceled because of its many errors and omissions, especially the error of 200 for 400 minae!

To close with one small detail. On ΤΟΙΞΑΞΙΞΤΑ B9 Comparetti remarks: "*niente giustifica la proposta troppo ricercata di Buck τοι's ἄσσιστα*." On the contrary this reading, which was first suggested by Keil, *Gött. Nachr.* 1899, page 148, is strongly recommended by the similar adverbial phrases El. *τοῖρ ἐπ' ἄσσιστα* and Cret. *οἱ ἐπ' ἄνχιστα πεπαμένοι*.

2. The Mantinean judgment. IG. V. 2. 262. Schwyzer 661. Buck 16.

Owing to the character of the stone and its weathered condition, which is not improved by its present position in the open court of the museum at Tegea, the inscription is most illegible, and it is not surprising that the text has required repeated revision since its first publication. Fougères' last revision, *Mantinee*, pages 523 ff., which is the one followed in my *Greek Dialects*, was superseded by that of Hiller von Gärtrigen, *Arkadische Forschungen* (*Abh. Berl. Akad.*, 1911), pages 15 ff., IG v. 2. 262, and this again is subject to some further corrections from the latest treatment of the inscription by Comparetti, *Annuario*, I, 1 ff., which is accompanied by a remarkably successful photograph, much superior to that published by Meister in 1911. While I have verified for my own satisfaction some of the new readings in which Hiller and Comparetti agree, such as the important *ὀγέοι* in line 14, I limit my comment to certain points in which they differ.

In line 15 Hiller reads ϵ^2 γνῶσιδικα κριθέε, Comparetti ϵ^2 γνῶσαι κα κριθέε. The latter is correct in reading the letter following γνῶσι as α (as it was also read by the earlier editors, who gave $\epsilon\iota$ ἀν ὁσαι), and in his recognition of γνῶσια = Att. γνῶσις in its legal sense. But he is certainly wrong in understanding κα = ἄν. It is probable enough that Arc. $\epsilon\iota\kappa$, the antevocalic by-form of $\epsilon\iota$, seen in $\epsilon\iota\kappa$ ἄν, etc., contains a formal relic of the κα, κε particle, but this no doubt had the form κε as in Cyprian, and furthermore this was wholly displaced as a significant particle by ἄν. We have here the usual κα = κατά and return to the earlier reading κακριθέε. The lines 15, 16, run then ὁσέοι ἄν χρῆστέριον κακρίνῃ ϵ^2 γνῶσαι κακριθέε τῶν χρεμάτων, "anyone whom the oracle has condemned or who by judicial process has been condemned to forfeit his property."

In line 18 Hiller reads ἐδικάσαμες and makes the positive statement (Ark. Forsch., p. 16) "Die untere Hälfte des σ ist noch deutlich." My observation agrees with Comparetti's that there is nothing left of this final letter, and as we shall not assume Arc. -μες without the most positive evidence the reading should be ἐδικάσαμε[ν].

In line 23 Hiller reads $\epsilon\iota$ δ' ἄλλά $\sigma\iota$ [ν]' ἔατοι κα τῶν[ν], $\iota\mu\mu\phi\epsilon\varsigma$ $\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$, while Comparetti reads $\sigma\iota\varsigma$ (ξ is in his transcription of ν), as did Fougères. I neglected to examine this line on the stone, but Comparetti's statement that the extant traces do not authorize the restauration of N, but rather ξ, is borne out by the photograph. His interpretation of the sentence (p. 12), however, is unconvincing, and his κα = ἄν is here doubly objectionable (cf. above on l. 15 and note the word-order). Schwyzer's tentative suggestion, "An sil $\epsilon\iota$ δ' ἄλλαξις ἔατοι, 'si mutatio admittatur'?" offers the most attractive analysis. For it permits the desired passive construction of ἔατοι, and ἄλλαξις κα τῶνν, "transgression of these provisions," would be a striking parallel to the Arcadian use of καταλάσσω, "act differently, transgress." But the formal difficulty in ἄλλαξις = *ἄλλαξις is considerable. The use of ν for ξ is unlikely, and it would involve at least a hitherto unknown use of it if we should resort to an *ἄλλα-τις, *ἄλλα-σις formed after the analogy of ἔλα-σις, γέλα-σις, δάμα-σις, and other such derivatives of vowel-stems.

The most important correction is in line 34, where a long-standing difficulty disappears, namely, the apparent necessity of choosing be-

tween τὸ τὸτ' ἕε, οὐτὸς, etc., with a verb form improbable for Arcadian (though again recently defended by Thurneysen, *Glotta*, XII, 147), or τὸ τότε ἕ(ς), οὐτὸς, etc., with a correction. I can confirm Comparetti's observation that there is no certain trace on the stone of the supposed *υ* which led to the reading οὐτὸς, that in fact the letter between *ο* and *τ* is wholly obliterated, so that we are at liberty to read τὸ τότε ἐό[ν]τος, which was long ago suggested by Dareste (*BCH*, XVII, 202). Accepting this reading, one must follow Comparetti in transcribing in line 33, and similarly in line 35, προσσθαγενὲς τὸ φέρ[γδ] instead of προσσθαγενὲς τὸ φέρ[γον]. This reverses the character of Themander's alibi. Instead of claiming that the deed of violence was prior to his presence in the temple, he must have claimed that his presence in the temple was prior to the deed, that is, prior only and excluding presence at the time of the deed. This seems somewhat labored, and it is perhaps for this reason that Schwyzler avoids the new construction by reading κὰς μὲ προσσθαγενὲς τὸ φέρ[γον]/τὸ τότε ἐόν, τὼς ἰν μόνφον θῆ[ναι]. But τὼς is superfluous in the conclusion, which is precisely parallel to the others that are without adverb, as ἴλαον ἔναι, ἰμμεφὲς ἔναι. The reading ἐό[ν]τος is much more probable, and with it, for better or worse, goes Comparetti's construction of προσσθαγενὲς¹ agreeing with Θέμανδρος.¹ We may perhaps ease the interpretation somewhat by taking προσσθα- in local instead of temporal sense and understanding that Themander had claimed to have been merely a spectator of the deed, the innocent bystander.

Other variations of Comparetti's text from that of Hiller, apart from a few letters in the proper names at the beginning, are not in the reading of what is on the stone, but in some of the restorations of the ends of lines 24 ff., and in the analysis of certain forms. Of the latter, his *hēs kláros* = ἐξ κλήρους instead of *Hēsklaros*, is attractive, but his *κατορρεντέρων* in lines 21, 22, will hardly displace Dittenberger's altogether convincing *κατόρρέντερον* = κατὰ τὸ ἀρρέντερον.

¹ In this inscription the sign for *θ* (and for *ο*) is a circle with dot in the center, that for *φ* the same with a vertical line running through the central dot. In the two occurrences of *προσσθαγενες* and likewise in the two of *Θέμανδρος* we have plainly *⊙* without vertical in the first occurrence of each, but *⊕* in the second. This is remarkable, as there is no such confusion in any other word containing *θ* or *φ*. The general probability of an error of omission rather than one of commission is in this case outweighed by the fact that *προσσθα-* is intelligible, *προσσφα-* not. Otherwise Comparetti, who assumes that *φ* was intended in both words (pp. 4, 13), yet translates *προσσφα-* as if it were *προσσθα-* (p. 16).

Comparetti differs radically from all previous commentators in his general conception of the judgment as an act of clemency rather than a condemnation and in his whole interpretation of lines 15-22. But this rests upon what he himself reads into the text (cf. the paraphrase, p. 16, of ll. 15-22 with the actual text) and is less probable than the older interpretation which he ridicules.

3. The Kleobis and Biton bases. Ditt. 5. Schwyzer 317.

In the signature of the Argive artist, . . . μέδες ἐποίηε χαργέιος, the uncontracted form of the verb arouses suspicions, and I have previously suggested (*CP*, VIII, 142), that the first of the two E's (for there is no doubt that it has three bars) is intended for F, as in the Delphian stadium inscription¹ and elsewhere. The same suggestion was made independently by Solmsen (*IF*, XXXI, 473). But instead of understanding ἐποίηε χαργέιος I would now prefer ἐποίηε 'Αργέιος, with the aorist, which is more common than the imperfect in dedications, and with the ethnic without article, which is again somewhat more common than the ethnic with article. The *h* for intervocalic *σ* is of course well known in Argive, and there is no doubt that the signature of the Argive artist was in his native dialect.

The remainder of the inscription shows certain Delphian influence in the form ματάρα, and was probably a Delphian addition, as suggested by Pomtow (Ditt. 5). Premierstein's reading τῶι δὲ γῶι is to be preferred to Pomtow's τοῖδ' υἱοί. Homolle (*Comptes rendus* [1924], pp. 149 ff.) now attempts a fuller restoration of the text, namely, [Κλέοβις καὶ Βί]των τὰν ματάρα σταδίου [τετρῶκοντα πέν]τε ἄγαγον τῶι δὲ γῶι [ἡνποδύντες?]. This has the merit, besides others, of disposing of the troublesome εἰγαγον.

4. The Damonon stele. IG. V. 1. 213. Schwyzer 12. Buck 66.

In line 36, Woodward (*BSA*, XIII, 178 ff.) reads πρᾶτ[ος π]αι(δ)όν (but the δ is clear on the stone, as I think he has himself observed later, the reference escaping me), and says it probably means that Enymacratides was the first boy to win such a series of victories. According to my observation, the space where the letters are wholly obliterated would be sufficiently filled by σπ, though it is impossible to say absolutely whether two or three letters are to be supplied. Although παρ[σπ]αίδον

¹ TONEONON = τὸν τοῖνον. I have no doubt of this despite the criticism of Fournier, *Rev. ét. anc.*, XXIV, 1 ff., who wishes to read τὸ νεῖνον.

was considered and rejected by Woodward (*loc. cit.*), it seems to me decidedly preferable, in view of the technical terms *πρατοπάμπαις*, etc., later discussed by him (*BSA*, XV, 46 ff.). The genitive will depend on the following *δο[λιχόν]*, just as in *IG. v. 1. 279: νεκάσας κασσητόριν πρατοπαμπαίδων, ἀτροπαμπαίδων*.

5. *IG. I Suppl. 477 p, p. 189.*

In this splendidly cut sixth-century inscription, conspicuous in the Hall of Archaic Sculpture in the National Museum, the *F* of *ἀφντάρ* is of interest not merely as one of the two certain Attic examples of *F* (in both cases for the glide before *v*), but also because its form is a striking exemplification of what must have been the transition stage between the usual *F* and the *Γ* of Chalcidian, etc. The form is Ξ , with the second bar so low that the upright extends below it no more than does the upright of the Ξ below the third bar. As the latter was regularized to *E*, so the former would likewise become *Γ*. In Etruscan inscriptions, which commonly have *F* or *Γ* (in retrograde form), a similar transition form also occurs, e.g., *CIE. 5314, 5316*. There may be other examples in Greek inscriptions, which have not been faithfully reproduced in the facsimile publications, notoriously inexact in such details (in fact, the *IG*-copy of our Attic inscription gives the ordinary *F*; the true form appears clearly in the photograph published in *Oest. Jhrh.*, XVI, 98). It is not given in any of the tables of the Greek alphabets (Kirchhoff, Roberts, Larfeld), where such a transition form certainly deserves notice.

6. Melian *Γρόφων* or *γρόφων*? *IG. XII. 3. 1075, Inschr. von Olympia 272. Roberts 7, 113 b. SGDI. 4871-2. Schwyzler 207, 209.*

Whether the *γροπρον*, *γροφρον* of these two inscriptions is to be taken as the artist's name *Γρόφων* or as a participle *γρόφων* is an old question, decided in favor of the participle in all the more recent publications of the texts, but revived by Elter (*Rh. Mus.*, LXVI, 212 ff.) in favor of *Γρόφων*, and by Bannier (*Berl. Phil. Woch.* [1914], pp. 1437 ff.) opposing this. Bannier has shown that Elter's arguments against the current interpretation of the older inscription, according to which Eephanthus was both donor and artist, are inconclusive, but on the other hand, his objection to Elter's interpretation, according to which Eephanthus was the donor and Grophon the artist, is by no means decisive. I revert to the question merely to indicate a linguistic argument which has not

previously entered into the discussion, but which deserves some consideration. Derivatives of *γράφω* show *γραφ-* in several dialects, while in the verb itself the *α* is constant, with one alleged but doubtful exception. Thus, omitting examples from Delphi, Elis, etc., we have from Argolis *γραφά*, *ἀγγροφά*, *ἐγγροφά*, *σύγγροφος*, *γραφίς*, *γραφεύς*, *γραφεύω*, but only *γράφω*, and from Crete *ἐνγραφος*, *ἀντίγραφον*, while there are about one hundred occurrences of *γράφω* and compounds with *α*. In *SGDI* 5024. 55, Blass reads *ἀπογράφονσι*, as if the dative plural of the participle, without explaining how such a form can be adjusted to the context. The line is mutilated and hopeless, but I have no doubt that Bergmann's *ἀπόγραφον* was correct so far.

A name *Γρόφων*, to be understood, of course, as of the *-ων*, *-ωνος* type, not of the participial type which is mostly late (*CP*, XVI, 269 ff.), would be in line with the derivatives mentioned, while a participle *γράφων* would be at variance with what is otherwise observed in the verb.

7. Argive *γεγράβανται*. Schwyzer 90. 12.

The *β*, though called unexplained by Bechtel (*Gr. Dial.* II, 496), is put in its proper connection by Vollgraff (*Mnemosyne*, XLIV, 71), and in Brugmann-Thumb (*Gr. Gram.*, p. 375). That is, it is a new example of that analogical interchange between *π*, *β*, *φ*, in roots ending in a labial, on account of common forms in *ψ* and *πτ*, which is seen in Mess. *κεκλεβός* (*κλέπτω*, *κλοπή*) and Cret. *ἀβλοπία* = *ἀβλαβία*, and which has reached larger proportions in Modern Greek (*κόβω*, *κρύβω*, *κλέβω*, etc.), where the influence of verbs in *-ανω*, *-ενω* is an added factor. As to *-ανται*, Vollgraff, Schwyzer, and Bechtel (*op. cit.*, p. 498) agree in regarding it as a substitution for *-αται*, similar to that of *-αντι* for *-ατι* in the active, and the first two compare the Ion. *πεποιέανται*, *γεγενέανται* quoted by Eustathius on *Od.* xx. 106. There is no other evidence of the existence of such forms in Ionic, the texts showing only *-ήαται* or the resulting *-έαται*, *-ήται*, of which *-έαται* occurs in inscriptions. Other evidence for *-ανται* is meager, and it is too much to say, with Vollgraff (*loc. cit.*), that this is confirmed by the Arg. *γεγράβανται*. For it is quite possible, and, as it now seems to me, preferable to analyze this form, not as *γεγράβ-ανται*, but as *γεγράβα-νται*, and to see in it, not a secondary form of the ending, but a secondary perfect stem. The encroachment of perfect stems in long vowel is well

known, e.g., with η ἄδῃκε Hippon., Locr. *ῥεῖαδῆκότα*, Ion., Arc., Epid. *λελάβηκα* (also in Archim.), ἤλθηκα in Boeot. *διεσεῖλθεικε*, Arc. *κατηνθηκότι*, with \tilde{a} Arg. *ἐπιμεμηνάκαντι* Dor. *μεμενακός* in Archim. Att. *μμένηκα*, ὑποδεδρόμακε in Sappho, Att. *δεδράμηκε*, *γεγεναμένον* in Pindar, Att.-Ion. *γγένημαι* (for these with \tilde{a} , cf. Vollgraff, *Mnemosyne*, XLIV, 236), while Att. *νενέμηκα*, late *γγεγράφηκα* may belong in either group.

8. The treaty between Delphi and Pellana. Haussoulrier, *Traité entre Delphes et Pellana*. Schwyzer 328^a.

The text has been established and the content exhaustively treated in Haussoulrier's monograph, to which add Wilhelm's note (*Ber. Berl. Akad.* 1922, pp. 27 ff.). The stone on which the inscription is cut is said to be of Peloponnesian origin, and was presumably sent from Pellana (cf. Haussoulrier, p. 171). But the text is Delphian, as is shown by an analysis of the dialect, which may be summarized as follows.

Influence of the Attic *κοινή*, which is to be expected at this time (262-50 B.C.) at both Delphi and Pellana, is seen in *oi* beside *τοί* (1:5), *ei* beside *ai* (4:17), *ān* once (IIA 11) beside usual *ai* *κα* or *ei* *κα*, *eis* beside *ēn* with accusative,¹ dat. sing. *πόλει* beside gen. sing. *πόλιος* (the usual form of mixture), infinitive in *-ειν* beside *-εν*, *δικασται* beside *δικαστήρες* (the latter only in IA), *ἀξιώχρεων* beside *ἀξίωχρεον* and in *ἐνδοθεν*, *ἔξοθεν* (Delph. *ἐνδός*, *ἔξος*).²

Dialectic features which are common to Phocis and Achaea are: \tilde{a} uniformly for original \tilde{a} , likewise from $\tilde{a}\omega$ (gen. plur. *-ān*), and from $\tilde{a}\circ$ or $\tilde{a}\omega$ in *θεαρός* (cf. Arc. *θεαρός*, but Boeot. *θεαωρία*) τ in *γνῶντι*, ξ in *καταδικαζόμενος*, uncontracted *eo* in *μέρεος*, numerals *τετράκοντα*, *πεντακάτιοι*, particles *ai*, *κα*, nom. plur. article *τοί*, gen. sing. *πόλιος*, *ποτί*, *πότ* = *πρός*, apocope in *ἀνά*, *παρά*, *κατά* (*ἐπ'ἀνφορον*, *παρ'γραψάσθω*, *καββαλόντων*), agent-noun in *-τηρ*, infinitives in *-εν* and in *-μεν*, *πεπᾶσθαι* = *κεκτῆσθαι*.

Features which conform to the dialect of Phocis but not to that of Achaea are: *ἔντε* IA4 (Ach. *ἔστε*), *έν* with acc. IIB14 (Ach. *εἰς*),

¹ *εἰσάγουσαν* IA 7, *έν τάν* [οἰ]σίαν IIB 14, hence the former is not Achaeian, but Attic, as often in late Delphian inscriptions. In IIB22 the stone has *EYΞ*, to be corrected to *eis*. Where Haussoulrier's text gives *έσ-*, which is neither Delphian nor Attic (ξ is unknown in Attic inscriptions later than the fourth century B.C.), it is merely a restoration that should be *εισ-*, e.g., *ἔσπραξεν* IIB 16, and in IA 14, IIA 25.

² In the restorations Haussoulrier has thoughtlessly given some Attic forms which are at variance with the practice of the text and should be amended accordingly, namely, *βλάβους* IIB 17 (cf. *μέρεος* IB4), and *ἀποδοῦναι* IIA 19, *διαλυθῆναι* IIB 21 (cf. *εἰμεν*, *μερίμεν*, *ἀποδιδόμεν*, uniformly *-μεν*).

ποιί IA6, IIA7, 10, κλαρών IA6, ἀδικείμενος IA6, third plur. imperat. -οντων (which is to be reckoned as Phocian, rather than as Attic; Ach. -οντω, and dialects which have this usually retain it in their mixed form), χρηίζω=θέλω. The first two are conclusive evidence of Delphian origin, and the others strongly indicative of the same, though the distribution of ποιί and of χρηίζω=θέλω is such that it would not be surprising if they should turn up in Achaean also.

Without local significance, but interesting additions to the scattered examples of the complete assimilation of nasal to following stop (Att. σύββαλεσθαι, etc.) are λαββάνοντες IB14 and σύββολον IB10, IIB16, 17, 21 beside σύμβαλον IA6.

In IB8, φιλατίας is the caption of a paragraph dealing with theft, likewise φιλα[τίας] in IIA13. Haussoulier takes this as a nominative singular "thief," since the other captions which occur, ὄρκος IA7, ψαφοφορία IA12, are in the nominative. But an agent-noun φιλατίας would be quite anomalous in formation, for the rather infrequent masculines in -τίας, are formed from neuter τ-stems, as κυματίας, σεισματίας, φρονηματίας, etc. In general, in captions we have the nominatives ὄρκος, ὁμολογία, νόμος, Φράτρα, etc., introducing the form of the oath, the agreement, etc., and ὄρκος persists even when it is not followed by the form of the oath but by directions for giving the oath. But otherwise for the subject-matter of legal or ritual prescriptions the genitive is usual, sometimes with περί, but oftener without. Thus in the mysteries inscription of Andania, IG v. 1. 1390, παραδόσιος, στεφάνων, εἰματισμοῦ, πομπᾶς, etc. (simple genitive seventeen times, genitive with περί four times, nominative once, namely, ὄρκος, infinitive clause twice), or in Ditt. Or. 183 χοός, πράξεως, κρηῶν, φρεάτων, ἀφεδρώνων. And so here, in spite of the previous use of the nominative, φιλατίας is certainly the genitive singular of a feminine abstract φιλαρία, "theft," corresponding to the φιλησία of Hesychius.

The group of words to which this belongs is given in our modern texts and lexicons in the form φη-, as φηλήτης, etc., and this is declared to be the correct spelling, of which φι- is a corruption. The latter was the spelling known to the old grammarians, as expressly stated (φιλήτης διὰ τοῦ ι γράφεται, σημαίνει δὲ τὸν κλέπτην), or implied by their bizarre derivations, e.g., from ὑφειλέτης (ὑφέλεσθαι) by hyphaeresis of the υ and the ε (of the first and second syllables) and the lengthening of the ε (of the third syllable), or from φιλέω, διότι φιλεῖ λαμβάνειν τὰ ἀλλότρια. In Hesychius we have two entries under φι-, one

under $\phi\eta$ -. For occurrences in classical texts the MSS vary, but with a preponderance of evidence in favor of $\phi\iota$ -. Cf. Allen and Sikes (*Homeric Hymns*, p. 144), note to iv. 67: "The correct spelling $\phi\eta$ - is almost entirely the property of p; in 175, however, the family also reads $\phi\iota$ -.; in Hes. *Op.* 375 the MSS are divided, but elsewhere the iota prevails." The fragment of Hellanicus (*Ox. Pap.* viii. 72), also has $\phi\iota$ -. It is difficult to see what first induced modern scholars to settle on $\phi\eta$ - as correct, unless it was the once believed, but altogether dubious, derivation from the root of $\sigma\phi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$. The only inscriptional occurrence previously known is $\phi\iota\lambda\eta\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$, *CIG* 2299 = Kaibel *Ep.* 1108, which Allen and Sikes (*loc. cit.*) in quoting change to $\phi\eta\lambda\eta\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$. The additional and earlier evidence furnished by $\phi\iota\lambda\alpha\tau\iota\alpha$ in the Delphi-Pellana Treaty ought to be decisive in restoring $\phi\iota$ - as the correct spelling in this group of words.

From IA13, αἱ δὲ κα μὴ παρίσκε-, Haussoulier restores a new word $\pi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, which he understands as a technical term for the denunciation of witnesses, like Att. $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\kappa\eta\psi\iota\varsigma$, and for the etymology compares the gloss $\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ $\acute{\lambda}\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$, so that the word would mean literally: "l'action de parler contre les témoins et faux témoins." There are several grounds for hesitation in accepting this restoration and derivation, namely, (1) the old question of the reality of an $\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\omega$, "say"; (2) the fact that words in $-\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ are not formed from thematic present stems, but from verbal stems in ϵ -, as $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon-\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon-\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, $\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon-\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, $\epsilon\ddot{\upsilon}\rho\epsilon-\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, etc.; (3) the meaning "against" for $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}$ in composition, which belongs only to the prepositional phrase compounds, like $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta\omicron\zeta\omicron\varsigma$, $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$. These are sufficient to warrant us in searching for other possibilities, and I suggest, with all reservation, the restauration $\pi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\kappa\epsilon[\psi\iota\varsigma] = \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\kappa\epsilon\psi\iota\varsigma$ with the well-known Phocian $\alpha\rho$ from $\epsilon\rho$, as in $\phi\acute{\alpha}\rho\omega$, $\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$, etc. It is true that this spelling tends to be displaced by the usual $\epsilon\rho$, as $\phi\acute{\alpha}\rho\omega$ by $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega$, and that in the case of $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$ there is no trace of it except in $\Pi\alpha\rho\acute{\omicron}\chi\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ (*SDGI* 2527) = Locr. $\Pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\chi\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ (*AM*, XXXII, 30, 65). But as in the proper name, so here in an old native legal term it might be retained. The meaning "examination," though milder than the "attack, denounce" of the Attic $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\kappa\acute{\eta}\pi\tau\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ and the Alexandrian $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, which Haussoulier compares, is adaptable to his conception of the proceeding intended.

I. THE CONSTRUCTIONS *INVIDEO ALIQUID ALICUI*
AND *INVIDEO ALICUI ALIQUA RE*
II. *INVIDEO ALIIS BONUM QUO* OR *INVIDEO ALIIS*
BONO QUO IN PLIN. *EPP.* i. 10. 12?

By S. E. STOUT

I

Id quod multi invident (Cic. *Pro Sest.* 102). *Quisnam florem liberum invidit meum?* (Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* iii. 9. 20). These two lines, which show the accusative with *invideo*, are quoted from Accius by Cicero. After the second he comments as follows: "*Male Latine videtur, sed praeclare Accius; ut enim 'videre,' sic 'invidere florem' rectius quam 'flori.' Nos consuetudine prohibemur: poeta ius suum tenuit et dixit audacius.*" Cicero considers the accusative to be the more natural and logical, but in his practice he conforms to accepted usage and employs the dative. There are no exceptions in his extant writings to this; he always uses the dative.¹ He regards the use of the accusative as a poetic license.

Two things may require expression after *invideo*: the person toward whom the feeling is directed and the thing that gives rise to the feeling. We envy a person because of something he has that seems to us good. In the Latin of all periods either of these two things could be and usually was expressed by the dative. First in the poets and later not infrequently in prose the thing that gives rise to the feeling is found expressed by the accusative. This is parallel to the English usage: "I begrudge you that discovery, I envy you your good luck." Two datives were not, however, used when both the person envied and the thing that gives rise to the feeling were to be expressed.² Commonly the thing was expressed by the dative and the person by a

¹ All modern editors accept Madvig's correction "*naturae vim vidisse*" for the earlier text "*naturam invidisse*" in *Tusc. Disp.* iii. 2.

² It seems likely, however, that both Caper (Keil *G.L.* vii. 92. 12) and Beda (*ibid.* 276. 2) were thinking of *divitiis* as dative in *Veteres tamen et hoc modo dixerunt: et invideo tibi divitiis, non divitias* (Caper). Note also Beda (*ibid.*): *Invideo divitem, invideo ei pulchritudinem.*

genitive or a possessive limiting the dative. Occasionally, the person is in the dative and the thing is expressed by a phrase introduced by *in* (with the ablative), *ob*, or *propter*; or it may be expressed by a causal clause introduced by *quod* or *quia*. The use of the accusative to express the thing is practically confined to places where both the person and the thing are to be expressed, the dative being used for the person and the accusative for the thing.

Before the construction was freely accepted in prose, one can occasionally see some special consideration that may have influenced the choice of construction. Compare *Ac ne eiusdem laudis commemorationem externis inideamus*, . . . (Val. Max. iv. 3. Ext. 1) with *Caesar . . . se illius (sc. Catonis) gloriae invidere et illum suae invidisse dixit* (*ibid.* v. 1. 10). In the first passage the more usual construction *externorum eiusdem laudis commemorationi* would have given an unpleasant accumulation of genitives with *commemorationi*, and the author avoided it by using the accusative, which would by this time give no shock to his readers because of its free use by the poets, especially Horace and Vergil. Again, compare *Haec sunt animi . . . invidentis gloriae meae indicia* (Curt. Ruf. vi. 9. 19) and *Ne inviderent sibi laudem quam peteret* (*ibid.*, ix. 4. 210). The fact that the praise was not yet his, but was merely his in prospect, seems to have influenced the author to use *sibi laudem* rather than *suae laudi* in the second instance. It need scarcely be pointed out also that when *invideo* was joined with another verb which required the accusative the zeugma made easier the use of the accusative, as in the following: *Sunt qui tibi mensis honorem Eripuisse velint invideantque, Venus* (Ovid *Fast.* iv. 86). *Modo te nox una deditque Inviditque mihi* (Stat. *Achil.* ii. 262). *Ede nefas, quod mirer ego invideantque Sorores* (Stat. *Theb.* viii. 68).

I omit examples of the dative, because it was in all periods an acceptable construction, practically the only construction when only one of the two things was to be expressed. I have found the following instances of the use of the accusative, all of them later than Accius, unless *hoc* is to be regarded with Bennett¹ as an accusative in Plaut. *Most.* 51: *Quasi invidere mihi hoc videre, Grumio, Quia mihi bene est et tibi male est*. Although I have not noted another case of the use of

¹ "The Cases," *Syntax of Early Latin*, pp. 119, 203.

the simple ablative of cause with *invideo*, it would seem better to me here to consider *hoc* a causal ablative on account of the *quia*-clause which follows. *Saeva Fors etiam nostris invidit questibus aures* (Catull. lxiv. 169). *Nolite, oro vos, inquit, id mihi dare "quod multi invideant," plures etiam concupiscant* (Nepos Thrasyb. iv. 3). Nepos was emboldened to use *quod* here by the well-known line of Accius, quoted above. It is a virtual or actual quotation. There is no good reason to supply *cum* without manuscript authority, merely because the construction seems unusual, as Nipperdey proposes.¹ In spite of the order, the addition of *concupiscant*, which also governs *quod*, made the construction less bold here. *Quia non, ut forsit honorem, iure mihi invideat te quoque amicum* (Hor. Sat. i. 6. 49). *Invideat quod et Hermogenes ego canto* (ibid. 9. 25). *Invidet usum Lignorum et pecoris tibi* (ibid. 14. 41). *Asconione pater Romanas invidet arces?* (Verg. Aen. iv. 234, where Servius comments on the construction as follows: "*Honestior elocutio est, si addamus quam rem invidemus.*") *Mihi tarda gelu saeclesque effeta senectus invidit imperium* (ibid. viii. 509, where Servius comments: "*Bona elocutio*"). *Tene . . . Invidit Fortuna mihi,* (ibid. xi. 42, where Servius supports the construction by reference to *Ecl.* vii. 58). *Liber pampineas invidit collibus umbras* (Verg. *Ecl.* vii. 58, where Servius comments: "*Nam 'invideo tibi illam rem' dicimus*"). *Nobis caeli te regia, Caesar, invidet* (Verg. *Georg.* i. 503). . . . *Ne mihi quam merui invideas, nutricula, mortem* (Ciris 277). *Quod quoniam nobis invidit inutile Fatum* (Ovid *Ex Pont.* ii. 8. 59). It is perhaps better with Weissenborn-Müller to regard *Etutam* as governed by *pacto* in Livy xlv. 30. 4: *Fama fuit Etutam pacto fratri eum invidisse*, where it is taken as the direct object of *invidisse* by Krebs-Schmalz (*Antibarbarus*, s.v. "*invidere*"). *Vel quibus illa (sc. stella) sacros non invidere meatus Notitiamque sui* (Manil. *Astron.* ii. 143). *Et fraudare bonis quae nec deus invidit ipse* (ibid. iv. 874). *Atque ideo faciem coeli non invidet orbi ipse deus* (ibid. 915). *Homini tamen misero non invideo medicinam* (Petron. *Sat.* 129). *Cereri id totum (sc. frugiferum Africae solum) concessit (natura), oleum ac vinum non invidit tantum satisque gloriae in messibus fecit* (Plin. *N.H.* xv. 8).² *Tu modo*

¹ *Opuscula*, pp. 146-47.

² *Non invidit tantum* seems an impossible reading. To drop *non*, as suggested by *Barbarus*, while paleographically inviting, would give a meaning inconsistent with the facts. Sillig's suggestion, *tantum non invidit*, would give a satisfactory meaning.

ne claros Minyis invideris actus (Valer. Flac. Arg. v. 507). *Nec famam invidit Apollo* (Sil. Ital. Bell. Pun. iv. 400). Here I would add Plin. Epp. i. 10. 12: *neque . . . invideo aliis bonum quo ipse careo*, which is discussed below. . . . *Magis mihi peram quam nuptias Pudentillae invidisses* (Apul. Apol. 22). *Quia mihi Fortuna divitias invidit* (*ibid.* 21). *Cuius operis pulchritudinem praestantiamque Rhodiis invidebat* (Gell. xv. 31. 3). *Ut mihi aliquis etiam carcerem invideat* (Calp. Flacc. Declamat. 4). *qui sibi hanc voluptatem . . . inviderent* (Spartian. Vit. Hadr. xx. 1). *Nam unum parricidium, alterum sui mores rei publicae inviderunt* (Spartian. Vit. Sev. xx. 3). *Quarum forma intercidens statim usum publicum invidit* (*ibid.* xix. 5). *Invidit Claudio longinquitatem imperii . . . fortuna* (Flav. Vopisc. Vit. Cari iii. 60). *Invideas sepulturam* (Iulius Valerius Alexander Polemius ii. 33). *Et caesis invidit arenam* (Claudian. De Bell. Gild. 198). *Tantumque suos invidet honores* (Claudian. In Prim. Cons. Stil. ii. 234). *Hoc est quod atri livor Hostis invidet* (Prudent. Cath. vii. 201). With this should be compared the corresponding passive construction by the same author, *invidentur ista nobis* (*Peristeph.* i. 76), which implies the construction with the accusative in the active. I know of no instance in literary Latin of the use of the accusative of the person with *invideo* corresponding to Horace's *ego cur . . . invideor* (A.P. 55), which is a bold use of the poet's license, a thing which he is defending at the moment.¹ We may, however, compare *inveisa sum a nulla proba*, from a poetical inscription of about 100 B.C. (C.I.L. i. 1194).

The foregoing examples have been collected by the help of such special *lexica* and *indices verborum* as were available to me at the time of writing. The list is not complete, but it is sufficient to show that the construction *invidere aliquid alicui* was first used by the poets, but that after Vergil, who used it exclusively, prose writers employed it with freedom. The statements of Servius, "*Honestior elocutio est si addamus quam rem invidemus*," and "*Invideo tibi illam rem dicimus*," represent the regular usage from early in the second century. The construction appealed not only to rhetoricians and writers, but also to the great body of users of the *sermo plebeius*, as it had to Cicero. It was needed, also, for it gave a slightly different emphasis from that

¹ Porphyrius and Pseud-Acron., *ad loc.*: *Invideor posuit pro: invidetur mihi*. Priscian Inst. (Keil G.L. iii. 271. 18): *auctoritate usus*. Augustinus de Grammatica (*ibid.* vi. 512. 17): *nova usurpatione*. Cf. Macrobius, *Excerpta Bobiensia* (*ibid.* v. 648. 22).

of *Invideo tuae rei*, which continued to be used where it more exactly expressed the intended meaning.

In the latter half of the first century another construction was favored in the schools and made some little headway with good authors. It first occurs in Livy ii. 40. 11: *non inviderunt laude sua mulieribus viri Romani*. As in most of the other instances of this construction, the manuscripts are not unanimous in its support, and the earlier editors print the accusative, *laudem suam*. The ablative, which seems to be the correct reading, was restored in this passage by Alschefski and Weissenborn (Madvig). It is a refinement of expression invented by Livy. The feeling of grudge or envy is thought of as going so far as to cause its possessor to deprive the person envied of the thing envied. This additional element of meaning is readily implied or suggested by the use of the ablative of separation. Like the accusative construction discussed above, this construction was used only when both the person (dative) and the thing (ablative) are to be expressed. When only one of the two is expressed, the dative is used. The only certain exception to this which I have observed in an author of the first rank is in the passage from Tacitus cited below, in whose sententious style this omission of the dative, easily supplied from the preceding clause, may be accepted, and might almost be expected. As it is better with Nipperdey to regard *exemplo* and *spectaculo* as datives, the more usual construction, in Tac. *Ann.* xv. 63: *non invidebo exemplo*, and Tac. *Germ.* 33: *Ne spectaculo quidem proelii invidere*, so it is better to consider the form as dative in Plin. *Epp.* ix. 23. 6: *qui nec ullius invides laudibus*. The addition of *ullius* gives a very frequent form of expression and makes the dative practically certain in this passage.

Besides the passage in Livy where this construction was first used, only nine other instances of it have been noted, all of them from the last half of the first century, five of them from the *Letters* of Pliny, to whom the construction appealed as a refinement of style. In my rather extensive search I have found no other instances of its use. Without more evidence we must question the statement of Krebs-Schmalz, "*dies wird in der nachklass. Prosa sehr häufig*," and that of Kühner-Stegman,¹ "*später [sc. after Livy] die herrschende Konstruktion*."

¹ *Lat. Gram.* (ed. alt.), p. 310.

Quintilian favored this construction. *Si anticum sermonem nostro comparemus . . . , ut "hac re invidere," non ut omnes veteres et Cicero praecipue, "huic rei"* (ix. 3. 4). We must read *huic rei* with Madvig¹ and Nipperdey.² Halm may be right against Madvig in giving *hanc rem*, which he adopts in his text, as the reading of Ambrosianus, but since Cicero invariably used the dative, Quintilian must have written *huic rei*. In view of the instances cited below of the use of the ablative by the most careful writers of the time of Quintilian, we should accept *hac re* earlier in the passage, although the older editors and some of the secondary manuscripts there give *hanc rem*. The examples of the use of the accusative cited above show that the use of the ablative was by no means uniform in Quintilian's time, but it was evidently favored in critical circles. We may assume that Pliny was influenced by the view of his teacher Quintilian.

The ablative is found in the best-supported text of the following: *Nec inuidebo vobis hac arte* (Sen. N.Q. iv. Praef. 7). *Ut tibi rationem reddam, qua nulli mortalium invideo* (Sen. Vit. Beat. xxiv. 5). *Invidet igne rogi miseris . . .* (Lucan Phars. vii. 798). *Ne hostes quidem sepultura invident* (Tac. Ann. i. 22. The note of Nipperdey on this passage is the starting-point of all the modern notices of this construction which I have seen). *Huic pietatis titulis invidere . . .* (Plin. Epp. iii. 8. 2). *Quousque et tibi et nobis inuidebis, tibi maxima laude, nobis voluptate* (ibid. ii. 10. 2). *Quid invident mihi felicissimo errore* (ibid. vii. 28. 2)? *Quid invidetis bona morte cui dare vitam non potestis?* (ibid. ii. 20. 8)? . . . *Ut vobis societate eius invideam* (ibid. ix. 13. 5).

Of the four most recent editors of critical editions of the *Letters of Pliny*, all give the ablative in the first three of these citations from Pliny. In the fourth, Kukula gives *bona mortis*, the reading of BF, while Merrill, after adopting *bonam mortem* from D in his *Select Letters of Pliny* (1903), has with reluctance accepted *bona morte*, the reading of MV, in his critical edition (1922); in the fifth, Merrill gives *societatem*. Carlsson³ seems to me to be right in defending the ablative in both passages. *Bona mortis* is an emendation of a misunderstood reading, a not infrequent occurrence in the BF tradition. After *bonam*

¹ *Emendationes Livianae*, p. 60, n. 1.

² *Loc. cit.*

³ *Zur Textkritik der Pliniusbriefe*, Lund and Leipzig, 1922.

came into the eight-book tradition by dittography of the letter *m*, some scribe wrote *mortem* to harmonize the syntax, giving *bonam mortem* of D. *Bona morte*, the reading of MV, which is in harmony with Pliny's usage, should therefore be accepted here. In the fifth passage, MDoux give *societate*, ia give *societatem*. We have therefore a consensus of the eight-book and the nine-book traditions against the ten-book tradition. It is not necessary, however, in this case to take into account the greater weight to be assigned in such a situation to the reading of the combined eight-book and nine-book traditions, a weighting that is contested, and which I hope to discuss in the near future. The predilection of Pliny for the ablative in this construction should be decisive here for the reading *societate*.

II

One other passage in Pliny's *Letters* is frequently cited as an example of the ablative construction with *invideo*. *Neque . . . invideo aliis bonum quo ipse careo* (i. 10. 12). This is the reading of BFDmouxa and is adopted by Kukula and Merrill. MSS MV read *bono quo*, which Keil and Müller print and Carlsson supports. After stating that the construction preferred by Pliny with the verb *invideo* "*ist in einem Falle wie diesem einzig Ausschlaggebende*," Carlsson cites the five passages quoted above, and concludes that "*der in der MV Familie überlieferte Ablativus die richtige Lesart ist*." He then adds: "*Die Ablativform ist auch als lectio difficilior zu betrachten, da es offenbar für einen unkundigen oder gedankenlosen Abschreiber nahe lag, dem Verbum ein Ack.-object zu geben*."

In regard to his first argument it should be noted that in all of the other examples the separative idea, the idea of depriving someone of something, is present to justify the ablative. In the first he will not refuse Suetonius' request for his friend and thus deprive him of the credit for *pietas*; in the second, Octavius by refusing to publish, is depriving himself of renown and his friends of pleasure; in the third, Pliny's critics, by undecieving him, would deprive him of the happiness of thinking his friends were very nice people; in the fourth, the doctors by keeping Blaesus alive are prolonging his sufferings and depriving him of kindly death; in the fifth, Pliny is not so eager for the glory of avenging Helvidius as to refuse to share it with Arria,

Fannia, and Anteia. In the passage under discussion he is not stating that he does not wish to deprive his friend Clemens of the pleasure and profit of hearing the philosopher Euphrates. The statement is general, not particular. Pliny is not one who feels any twinge of jealousy if others enjoy a pleasure that he must himself forego because of other pressing demands upon his time. *Sed contra, sensum quendam voluptatemque percipio si ea quae mihi denegantur amicis video superesse.* To express this feeling, which does not extend so far as the will to deprive, the ablative would not be accurate and the accusative was the natural construction, already well established in usage. The distinction is rather fine, too fine to have weight except in the artificial straining after fine distinctions in speech that characterize the discussions in the classroom of the professor of syntax or rhetoric and the practice of those writers who particularly seek elegance of form in their composition. For that reason it made no headway in the common speech, little among writers, and passed out of use entirely with the passing of the influence of the rhetoricians of the middle of the first century. There can be no doubt that the use of the accusative was current in common speech and was received as correct in Pliny's time. Carlsson in discussing another passage has pointed out the probability of the influence of Vergil in Pliny's choice of a mode of expression. It is significant here, too, that Vergil was very partial to this use of the accusative with *invideo*.

As to Carlsson's second point, that an ignorant or inattentive scribe might easily have fallen into the error of writing an accusative after *invideo*, we may note, first, that it is a confession of the naturalness of the accusative here. Then we have here the unanimous support of two independent manuscript traditions for the accusative, that of the eight-book and the ten-book traditions. The assumption that the same error has arisen independently in two traditions is always open to serious question, and is to be admitted only upon compelling considerations. By the laws of probability, the likelihood of the same error arising independently diminishes very rapidly with the number of independent occurrences of the error assumed. Finally, the change from *bonum* to *bono* under the influence of the following *quo*, a word closely connected with *bonum* and likely to be picked up by the scribe in the same glance at his parent-manuscript, is a kind of error quite

frequent in all manuscripts. It would be made more easy here by the *o* in the first syllable of *bonum*. An examination of a few pages of the apparatus in Merrill's edition reveals the following instances of similar errors in MSS MVBF in a little more than two of the ten books of the *Letters*: *Quae agenda fuerint salva* M for *quae agenda fuerint salvo* (ii. 17. 2); *ventus inquietus* BF for *ventis inquietus* (ii. 17. 16, where Merrill's partiality for BF causes him to receive the error into the text, in spite of the plural *venti* immediately following. Cf., also, Carlsson, p. 31); *digni illo patri* M for *digni illo patre* (ii. 18. 4); *omnisque quis* MV for *omnisque quos* (ii. 19. 9); *quo potissimum* BF for *qua potissimum* (ii. 20. 1); *qua die qua hora* MV for *quo die qua hora* (ii. 20. 3); *quibus praeceptis imbuaris* B for *quibus praeceptis imbuaire* (iii. 1. 6); *utraque lingua lyrica doctissima mira* BFD, where the occurrence of five successive case-forms in *a* creates a presumption at least in favor of the reading *doctissime* of MV, which is adopted by Müller and Keil (iii. 1. 7); *hoc quoque* M for *haec quoque* (iii. 5. 2); *illo quoque noctibus* MV for *ille quoque noctibus* (iii. 5. 9); *fremitum in secessum solum* BFD for *fremitum in secessu solum*, where again the error has crept into two independent families of manuscripts, an error that is far more likely to do this than the reverse error, such as writing *bonum quo* for *bono quo* (iii. 5. 14); *me quidem* M for *me quidam* (iii. 5. 19); *quam suam* FV for *quam suum*, where one manuscript in each family has preserved the correct reading and the other one in each shows how easy the error is to make (iii. 7. 8); *omnino Artemidori nostro* M for *omnino Artemidori nostri*, where the three words were caught by the scribe of M in one glance at his parent-manuscript and the four *o*'s induced the fifth (iii. 11. 1); *quid egi* M for *quid ego* (iii. 13. 4); *epistulam dignam* V for *epistula dignam* (iii. 14. 1); *ipsam religiosissimam* M for *ipsam religiosissimae* (iii. 15. 2); *longua epistula* F for *longa epistula* (iv. 11. 16); *boni civi* B for *bono civi* (iii. 18. 1); *topiarioro* B for *topiariorum* (iii. 19. 1); *sint ei liberi* B for *sunt ei liberi* (iv. 15. 2); *gaudeo meo* MV for *gaude meo* (iv. 16. 1); *tua lauda* M for *tua laude* (iv. 20. 2); *quos istos* M for *quos istis* (iv. 26. 2); *quidam sinas* V for *quidem sinas* (iv. 28. 3); *Heia tu cum proxima* MV for *Heia tu cum proxime* (iv. 29. 1); *moras crebras* M for *moras crebris* (iv. 30. 6). In view of the ease and frequency with which this assimilation of termination is made, we must assume that the writing of *bono quo* in one

family of manuscripts is paleographically a more likely error than the conscious or unconscious substitution of the accusative *bonum* for the ablative *bono* in the phrase *invideo aliis bono quo*, if that had been the original reading. The similarity of the endings in *bono quo* would have strongly tended to protect an original *bono quo*. We must therefore, I think, with Kukula and Merrill accept *bonum* as the correct reading in this passage.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

ARCHILOCHUS AND CATULLUS

One of the most famous lines of Archilochus was his comparison of himself to the cicada, "which is by nature garrulous, even without occasion or necessity, and when touched it but shrills the louder"; so, freely, after Lucian's adaptation of the line to himself at the opening of the *Pseudologistae*: τὸ δὲ τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου ἐκεῖνο ἤδη σοι λέγω, ὅτι τέττιγα τοῦ πτεροῦ συνείληφας. From Lucian Bergk reconstructed the iambic dimeter τέττιγα δ' εἰληφας πτεροῦ (frg. 143), which Diels, from two Byzantine imitations, was able to fix more accurately in the form τέττιγος ἐδράξω πτεροῦ. The celebrity of the line is attested by the response of the Pythian oracle to the slayer of Archilochus, to go for appeasement of the soul of the dead man ἐνθα τέττιξ τίθαπται, that is, with oracular obscurity of allusion, to the tomb of the poet.¹

To recover the circumstances under which this comparison was spoken, or the identity of the person to whom it was addressed, has seemed apparently hopeless. Bergk and his successors have left the line in isolation (frg. 143), even from conjectural context, and as for the person, Lucian's periphrasis says merely πρὸς τινος τῶν τοιούτων (sc. τῶν περιπετῶν τῇ χολῇ τῶν ἰάμβων αὐτοῦ) ἀκούσας κακῶς, and modern scholars have not gone beyond this (cf. Hauvette, *Archiloque*, p. 218). It is however possible by comparison of Lucian with Catullus to recognize Lycambes as the object of the poet's warning not to rouse the cicada, and to place the fragment in context with two others, in one of which Lycambes is named specifically. I will first set down the relevant lines of Catullus (40).

Quaenam te mala mens, miselle Ravide,
agit praecipitem in meos iambos?
Quis deus tibi non bene advocatus
vecordem parat excitare rixam?
An ut pervenias in ora vulgi?
Quid vis? qua lubet esse notus optas?

On this epigram Scaliger, with discernment uncanny for his time and with characteristic brevity, remarked: *Omnino huic simile illud ex epodiis Archilochi*:

πάτερ Λυκάμβα, ποῖον ἐφράσω τόδε;
τίς σὰς παρήγειρ φρένας;
ἤς τὸ πρὶν ἡρήρευσθα· νῦν δὲ δὴ πολὺς
ἄστοῦσι φαίνεται γέλως [frg. 94].

¹ For this as the original form of the oracle see Piccolomini, *Hermes*, XVIII (1883), 269.

I have quoted the whole fragment as it is now known. Scaliger, however, cited only the first two lines, which were all that were known in his time.¹ Scaliger's observation has been carried on by subsequent commentators, but without further penetration, except that

τίς ἄρα δαίμων καὶ τεοῦ χολούμενος [frg. 95],

which Bergk places next in his collection, has been drawn into the comparison.

But much closer to the epigram of Catullus is a portion of Lucian's paraphrase of the lines containing allusion to the τέττιξ, which I have not found cited in this connection. Speaking there of the poet's comparison of himself to the cicada, he continues (paraphrasing the words of Archilochus):

καὶ σὺ δὲ, ἔφη, ὦ κακόδαιμον ἄνθρωπε, τί βουλόμενος ποιητὴν λάλον παροξύνεις ἐπὶ σεαντὸν αἰτίας ζητοῦντα καὶ ὑποθέεις τοῖς ἰάμβοις;

How much there is here that Catullus has reproduced it is scarcely necessary to point out: *quaenam* (τί βουλόμενος) *te mala mens* (ὦ κακόδαιμον ἄνθρωπε, which reaches over to *miselle*); both *agit* and *excitare* are the reflection of something which Lucian preserves in *παροξύνεις*; *praecipitem in meos iambos* (περιπετεῖς τῇ χολῇ τῶν ἰάμβων αὐτοῦ); *quis deus* (τίς δαίμων) *tibi non bene advocatus* (equivalent to *iratus*, καὶ τεοῦ χολούμενος). *Vecordem*, demoted, contains a hint of *τίς σὰς παρήγειρ φρένας*. It is of course a transferred epithet belonging to the characterization of the person attacked. In *pervenias in ora vulgi* there is perhaps a reminiscence of *δοτοῖσι φαίνειν γέλως*. *Quid vis* at the end is so idiomatic that it need scarcely be thought of as matching *τί βουλόμενος*. As for the remainder of Catullus' epigram, there is nothing in Lucian to suggest its presence in Archilochus, though the conceit of paying for rashness with long-enduring penalty may easily have been derived from the same source.

If I am not mistaken, we have here a closer adaptation of Archilochus than—at least with our present resources—is to be found elsewhere in Catullus. For Archilochus it yields the conclusion that the illustration of rousing the cicada was said of Lycambes, and stood in relation to fragments 94 and 95. From the threefold source (the fragments of Archilochus, the paraphrase of Lucian, and the verses of Catullus) which has enabled us to make this connection, I venture to conjecture that we may discern, and in some slight measure reconstruct, the opening shot in the iambist's warfare upon Lycambes and his house. Lycambes had broken off the betrothal of his daughter to Archilochus, not without words of depreciation or insult for the arrogant poet, whose bitter tongue (as Pindar says) was no friend to

¹ The two first lines are cited by Hephaestion and Marius Victorinus. The two remaining lines seem to have become known first on the publication of the *Scholia in Hermog.* by Wals (VII, 2, 820) in 1834.

thrift. The father's words come to the ear of the rejected suitor, who marvels that the man should so deliberately challenge him to attack:

What is this that you say, father Lycambes? Who has robbed you of the reason on which before you leaned so securely? But now in truth are you become a laughing-stock to your fellow-townsmen [94]. What god pray, or in anger at what [95], has kindled you to stir up a creature garrulous like me, looking for nothing better than themes for his iambs [Lucian]. You have seized in fact a cicada by the wing [143 from Lucian], which shrills by nature and without occasion, and when touched shrills the louder [Lucian]. What do you mean? Do you desire to become notorious at any cost? You shall pay for your rashness with a penalty that shall endure for long [Catullus].

G. L. HENDRICKSON

NEW HAVEN

HOMERIC *ἔκη* : *κείαντες*

In Heyne's edition of the *Iliad* (1802) we find such spellings as *ἔκη*, *κῆαι*, *κείομεν*, *κείαντο*, *κείαμενος*; in Wolf's edition of the *Odyssey* (1807) such as *ἔκη*, *κείον*, *κῆαι* (*κατακείαι*, *κακκείαι*), *κείαντες*, *κείαμενος*, besides an isolated example (γ 9) of *ἔκηαν*. In a review (1809) Bekker¹ protested: "*nützt irgend-wozu die dreifache Verlängerung des Aorists von κείω? ἔκεια, ἔκη, ἔκη . . . Aristarchus schrieb ἔκη (Harlej. schol. zu v 26) und so mit ihm zu schreiben darf uns wenigstens Hermann Toll nicht hindern. . . .*" In a minor matter this criticism of Wolf is unfair, for his isolated *ἔκηαν* should be judged as a misprint; but what interests me more is the underlying assumption that there must be one spelling throughout, and also the belief that the practice of Aristarchus should be decisive.

The spelling with *κη* in all forms passed into Bekker's edition of 1843; and before that Spitzner (1832-36) is said to have adopted the same readings, discussing the problem in an (inaccessible) excursus on H 333. In 1869 La Roche² re-examined the question on the basis of his fuller collations. He started with the same prepossessions, and reached the same conclusion. This too, though he had observed one fact which might have suggested a more complex solution—his MSS while giving *αι*-forms strong support in some passages never varied in writing *ἔκη(ν)*. Under such influences it is not surprising that the practice of always writing *κη* has become, in the editions I can consult, all but universal: Hayman, to be sure, was a belated convert learning the doctrine between *κείαντες*, v 26, and *κημένω*, π 2; but the one important exception is Leaf, who in his edition of the *Iliad* reproduces the spelling of the MSS.

For if we turn to Ludwich's *Commentary* (the only one of service in such a question) we will see that except at ο 97 the MSS are in substantial agreement about the orthography of each form; only sometimes it is the *η*-spelling,

¹ *Hom. Bl.* i. 64 f.

² *Hom. Unt.*, pp. 158 ff.

sometimes the *α*-spelling that receives their support. Nor is the change from one to the other made at random. The indicative *ἔκῃα*, *ἔκῃε(ν)*, *ἔκῃαν*, is found, A 40, Z 418, Θ 240, Φ 349, X 170, Ω 34, γ 273, δ 764 (v. l. ι 553), ρ 241, τ 366, χ 336; in the last passage two MSS (PH) read *ἔκειαν*, but there is no other variant of that type.¹ The optative (*κῆται*, Φ 336; *κῆταιεν*, Ω 38) also shows no such variant; nor does the infinitive (*κατακῆται*, κ 533, λ 46; *κακκῆται*, λ 74) show any serious divergence except that at ο 97 the MSS divide between *κῆται* FGDU (m. 2) and *κείται* PHXU(m.1)LW. On the other hand, the imperative is *κείον* φ 176 without variant. For the subjunctive *κείομεν* H 333, 377, 396, is by far (ASQ) the better-attested form; and so also are *κείαντες* ι 231 ν 26, *κείόμενος*, -ω, -οι I 234 π 2 ψ 51, and *κείαντο* I 88. The *testimonia* cited by Ludwig confirm these readings. The one important exception, to which I shall return, is that in λ 74 Hesychius, Apollonius Sophistes, and Herodian all read *κακκείαι*. Eustathius still keeps up the tradition except that he has *κῆτάμενοι* as well as *κείόμενοι*; only the T-scholia (at I 76, 219) seem with their *κῆαντο*, *κῆαντες* to have generalized the *κη*-spelling, and even then the B-scholia (at I 219) with their *κείαντες* are in opposition, probably representing more faithfully the orthography of the common source.

The tradition then is stable—surprisingly so when we remember the dangers from *itacism*—and with the progress of historical grammar it has proved possible to understand why *η* appears in some of these forms, and *α* in others. It is but one case of a variation that appears in many other words. The general principle controlling it was observed by Monro,² but a far better discussion of the problem is given by K. Meister, who reaches the conclusion³ the spelling *εα*, *εο*, *εω* is found “überall da, aber auch nur da, wo in der jüngern ionischen Sprache eine durch Metathesis umgestaltete Form lebte, die, von dem *e-Laut* abgesehen, metrisch gleichwertig war.” From this rule *ionischen* should be stricken out, for it is conceded on the following page that we do not know where and when the *α*-forms entered the text.

Monro does not seem to have duly appreciated his observation; and while he connects *κείαντες* with Attic *κείαντες*, he stops at that point and the spelling of subsequent editions, both his own and others, has remained unaffected. On the other hand, Meister could not make the proper application of his rule to our problem; for the uniformity of our texts had led him into a belief (p. 167) that *ἔκῃα*, *κῆται*, *κῆον*, etc., are to be classed as “*variantenlos*.” He therefore explains the spread of *η* throughout this tense as due to the analogy of *ἔκῃε(ν)*. That did happen—but in Western Europe and in the nineteenth century.

The diversity that in reality demands explanation is due to the fact that when these forms became obsolescent, some forms outlived others. The only

¹ *App. Rh.* i 558 the MSS vary between *κῆαν* and *κείαν*; with Lautensach I should read the former, though the editors prefer the latter.

² *Hom. Gram.*¹, p. 385.

³ *Hom. Kunstep.*, p. 165.

form now quotable from the later language¹ is the participle *κείαντες*, which survived in Attic to the end of the fifth century. This explains *κείαντες*, the analogy of which has attracted *κείαμενος*, and through it the only other middle form *κείαντο*. An imperative **κείον* does not occur in the fraction of fifth-century Attic that has reached us, but its existence must be inferred from *κείον*, to which *κείομεν* is analogic.

The analogy went apparently a little farther, but without complete success. Of the four examples of the infinitive but one λ 74 is used as an imperative; it would thus come under the analogy of *κείον*, while the possibility of taking it as an imperative middle would bring it under the influence of *κείαντο*. The result would be a wavering of the MSS between *KAKKEIAI* and *KAKKHAI*, and I would thus explain the fact that *ἡ κοινή* read one of these forms, and Aristarchus the other. Corruption in the *scholia* deprives us of more precise information; but as *κακκῆαι* is read by Macrobius and our MSS, while *κακκείαι* is found in Hesychius, Apollonius Sophistes, and Herodian, I should ascribe the latter to Aristarchus. The opposite opinion is usually held on grounds which, I think, will not bear examination.

The difference in spelling, then, cannot have originated later than the fifth century. Obviously it can never have been seriously confused in the MSS; for if it had once been lost, it could never have been recovered. The corollary to that is: If Aristarchus, as is generally believed, read *κη* in all these forms, he schoolmastered the language with a vengeance. The thing would go far beyond such cases as those discussed by Cauer,² and needs strong evidence. It rests only on the lemma of a single (H) MS which at v 26 reads: *μῆρα δὲ κήαντες* οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος. In the text *κήαντες* is read with a note γρ' *κήαντες*, and it is possible that the lemma has been assimilated to this. Herodian reads *κείαντες*, and he might be expected to have the Aristarchean spelling. Accepting the note it proves no more than that Didymus found in his imperfect copy of Aristarchus *κήαντες* in this one passage—compare Cauer's discussion of *ἐπεβόαντο*. A belief that Aristarchus read *κήαντες* here, therefore *κακκῆαι* in λ 74, and *κῆον*, *κῆομεν*, *κῆαμενος*, *κῆαντο* elsewhere must be abandoned.

Three conclusions, it seems to me, may be drawn: (1) An editor, who is not undertaking to reconstruct a form of the text earlier than that of the fifth century, should do as Leaf did—follow the MSS. Compare, also, the remarks of Meister (p. 166) on the broader question of *η*- or *αι*-spellings. (2) The facts fit well the belief in an "Attic" Homer; one who assumes an "Ionic" Homer must make the further *ad hoc* assumption that the obsolescence in Ionia ran parallel to that in Attica. (3) We have another exemplification of the steadiness of the tradition.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

¹ Cf. Lautensach, *Die Aoriste bei den att. Trag. u. Kom.*, p. 115.

² *Grundr.*, pp. 62-64.

NOTE ON PLATO LAWS 659B

ἐναντιωσόμενος τοῖς τὴν ἡδονὴν μὴ προσηκόντως μηδὲ ὁρθῶς ἀποδιδούσι θεαταῖς.

Jowett renders this: "He ought to be the enemy of all pandering to the pleasure of the spectators." Apelt: *denjenigen entgegenzutreten, die den Zuschauern einen Genuss bereiten, der wider Anstand und Sittlichkeit verstösst*. That is substantially the interpretation of Ast, Stallbaum, Müller, Schultess, Wagner, and England.

Old Ficino understands the judge's opposition to be, not to the pandering poets, but to the spectators, who feel the wrong kind of pleasure. This is, I think, demonstrably right, and both from the point of view of Plato's meaning, and of the usage of ἀποδιδόναι, the matter is worth reopening.

1. The entire context is concerned with the question whose pleasure is the criterion of art. Plato urges that it is not the pleasure of the undisciplined multitude but that of the one who knows. And for this reason the judge ought to be guided by his own better knowledge, and not by the votes or clamors with which the mob testifies its pleasure (cf. 659A: ἐκκληττόμενον ὑπὸ βοῦν τῶν πολλῶν. 700C κρότοι ἐπαίνους ἀποδιδόντες). Otherwise the mob educates itself, and corrupts its own pleasures, instead of being lifted above itself, and the result is a theatrocracy (701A). The abrupt intrusion into this context of opposition to the poets would be wholly out of place. The separation of τοῖς from its noun θεαταῖς required by my construction is almost a mannerism of the style of the *Laws*. (An unpublished Chicago dissertation of Professor W. E. Berry on "The Order of Words in Plato's *Laws*" collects the examples.) 2. The generally accepted version is also improbable, not to say impossible, from the point of view of the language. I doubt if a case can be found of ἀποδιδόναι used of giving pleasure to an audience. But the meaning which the other interpretation requires is a natural development of the normal usage, and is quite sufficiently attested, though the lexicons neglect it. I may call it the psychological or functional meaning. The person, the mind, the faculty, the organ, is regarded as the instrument that performs its function, renders its effect, rightly or wrongly. Approximating to this use are the many occurrences of ἀποδιδόναι with ἔργον or ἐνεργείας in Aristotle and his commentators. Still closer are Simplicius on *Ar. De. An.*, page 152. 23. ὅθεν οὐδὲ καθαρὰν ἀποδίδωσι τὴν κρίσιν παραποδίζόμενον ὑπὸ τῆς πάθης; *Ar. Rhet.* 1356 a 5: οὐ γὰρ ὁμοίως ἀποδίδομεν τὰς κρίσεις λυπούμενοι καὶ χαίροντες; Anon. *In Ar. Eth. Nich. Heylbut.* 194. 9: μὴ κατέχειν τὴν ὀργὴν ἀλλὰ ταχέως αὐτὴν ἀποδιδόναι; Themist. *De. An.* 94. 12: δυνάμει . . . ἢ τὰς διαφόρας ἐνεργείας ἀποδίδωσιν.

In modern language Plato expresses the response of the spectators to the stimulus of art by ἀποδιδούσι. If the response is the wrong kind of pleasure in the wrong thing, the judge ought to oppose it. Else in giving the people what they want, you will give them what the lower self wants and corrupt their pleasures.

PAUL SHOREY

BOOK REVIEWS

L'Empereur Julien, Œuvres Complètes, Volume I, Part 2, "Lettres et Fragments," translated by J. BIDEZ. Paris: Société D'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1924.

Classical Philology has hitherto been a little remiss in its recognition of the admirable work done by the Association Guillaume Budé. We hope to remedy this deficiency and find reviewers who will do justice to its excellent publications. Among the most excellent is this masterly edition of the letters of Julian by Professor J. Bidez. Professor Bidez was prepared for his task by many years' study of his author and by that long collaboration with M. Cumont of which he speaks in the dedication to him of this volume.

The letters of Julian, as Professor Bidez truly says, if preserved entire, would vie in interest with those of Cicero. Even as it is they are among the most instructive remains of antiquity. This edition and the third volume of Mrs. Wright's translation make them at last completely accessible to the student of history, literature, and institutions. To this end Professor Bidez wisely relegates the spurious or doubtful letters to an Appendix and arranges the others in chronological order. It is by far the most helpful arrangement. And this together with Professor Bidez' illuminating Preface and his special historical and critical Introduction giving the circumstances and the purport of every letter makes the volume, apart from its other services to scholarship, a model historical biography.

It has the further recommendation to my judgment of more nearly doing justice to Julian than any other studies with which I am acquainted. The amiability of Julian's personality is perhaps a matter of taste. But of his ability, his scholarship, and his conscientiousness according to his lights there can be little doubt. On two other points Professor Bidez judges Julian more favorably than I fancy Mrs. Wright does. He emphasizes more the statesman and less the sophist, the mystic, and the thaumaturgist. On the last point even Professor Bidez does not go far enough for me. I can find no evidence in his extant writings that Julian was in any fair sense of the term a "superstitious mystic." He seems to me at least as rational as Professor James, Mr. Maeterlinck, or, alas, the Professor Murray of recent "psychological experiment." But this would be a topic for leisurely fireside discussion.

For a critic master of both languages a comparison of the two translations would be a profitable study in comparative idiom. Both are well written and it need hardly be said substantially correct. The French has perhaps more

eloquence, finish, and charm, the English perhaps sometimes retains more of the raciness of idiom or the picturesqueness of metaphor.

Professor Bidez coming after Mrs. Wright has corrected a few slight inadvertences. In 441C his rendering of *λογιδίων* and *μαθημάτων* is, I think, to be preferred. In 404B *les plus sages* is better for *λογιώτατοι* than "most eloquent." In 423D *ιερείων* means *la chair des victimes* rather than "temple worship." And there are two or three other passages of this rescript on Christian teachers that he seems to have understood more exactly. In *Ep.* 79(78) *ὥσπερ μαρτυρόμενος* is *comme pour m'en prendre à témoin* rather than "producing evidence." In *Ep.* 60(10). 379B the Greek means *à se donner du loin vis-à-vis de vous une attitude modérée politique exemple de tyrannie* and not "to prevent his acting far more like a tyrant." In the difficult passage 424A, Bidez' text, of which he here gives no explanation, is more intelligible, and Mrs. Wright's translation of hers is, I think, impossible. But both text and interpretation are far from clear.

Mrs. Wright has always been happy in tracing Julian's quotations and allusions to their sources. Such things are perhaps common property. But Professor Bidez seems sometimes to have followed her. In other cases he supplements her as in the explanation of *ἡ διπλὴ κατὰ Πλάτωνα ἄγνοια* 444C by references to *Apol.* 21D, *Laws* 863C, *Sophist* 229B, the note on *τοῦμόν ὄναρ* 432B to which might have been added a note on Callimachus, the reference in *Ep.* 68 to Plato *Ep.* 318E for *λυκοφιλία*. The subject is infinite. Neither happens to illustrate *τῇ κακηγόρῳ γλώττῃ* 445B by *Phaedrus* 254E. Both on 288B refer *πολιτικοῦ ζῆλου καὶ ἡμέρου* to Aristotle, *Polit.* 1253 a 3. But I think Julian must have been thinking rather of Plato *Phaedo* 82B. There is no *ἡμερον* in the famous Aristotelian passage. In *Ep.* 80 *διὰ χειρὸς ἔχειν* may be a reminiscence of Thucydides, and in 296D *τά γε τῆς εὐνοίας παρὰ πολὺν* is almost certainly a reminiscence of Thucydides ii. 8.

The two texts suggest many interesting questions. But I should as soon think of arguing with the master of thirty legions as with a scholar who, like Professor Bidez, has examined seventy manuscripts of his author. In 427D he adopts Parmentier's brilliant emendation *ὀψὲ* for *ὄψει*. In 403D he reads *ὑμνοῖς* while Mrs. Wright prefers *νόμοις*. In 386A he accepts the *τὰ δὲ μετὰ φρονήσεως* of P. Thomas which restores sense. In 390A, B, for the, I think, hardly possible *σὺ δὲ ὃ φίλε πάρει, καὶ παρὰ δύναμιν ἐπέχθῃσι*, he reads *φίλε πάτερ, εἰ καὶ παρὰ, κ.τ.λ.* In 422C he expresses doubt about the parenthetical *οἶμαι* which I think consideration of the idiomatic, almost colloquial, use of *κακά* might qualify (cf. Plato *Rep.* 346E and Euripides *I.A.* 658). In *Ep.* 80 *ἐπέξελεθε γενναίως αὐτόν* can hardly mean either *prends-le à partie vigoureusement* or "get rid of him in a dignified way." Should we not emend by introducing *ἐπέξελεθῆν*? In 452B *λίαν ἔχεν ἐκείνο καλῶς εἰωθεν*, etc., his reading *λίαν ἔχεν* is excellent, but I doubt if the text is completely healed or if *εἰωθεν* will bear the translation *j'ai pris l'habitude d'apprécier*, etc. May not *ἔοικεν* be the remedy?

PAUL SHOREY

The Works of the Emperor Julian. With an English translation by WILMER CAVE WRIGHT. Loeb Classical Library. In three volumes. Volume III. London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1923.

The third volume of Mrs. Wright's *Julian* exemplifies the happy combination of scholarly and literary attainments which we have noted in its predecessors.¹ The anticipatory observations in our review of Professor Bidez (*supra*, pp. 161 f.) hardly do justice to it since the slight exceptions taken there are insignificant in the mass of this admirable volume that completes her long task. The full, readable Introduction, the Index, and the notes supply rather more miscellaneous literary and antiquarian information than Bidez generally found space to give and make the work much more than a mere translation. Especially useful and meeting a want in American libraries is the appended text and translation of Neumann's reconstruction of Julian's treatise against the Christians. In 148C, page 358, *εἰ δὲ μεμικόν τινα τιμήσας ἐκείνος ἀντιτίθηναι αὐτῷ τὴν τοῦ παντὸς ἡγεμονίαν*, must we not emend reading *ἀντιτίθηναι*? I doubt if the text will bear the translation, "and then makes the lordship of the whole universe contrast with his power"!

PAUL SHOREY

A History of Magic and Experimental Science during the First Thirteen Centuries of Our Era. By LYNN THORNDYKE, Professor of History in Western Reserve University. Vol. I: pp. xl+835; Vol. II: pp. viii+1036. New York: Macmillan Company, 1923. Price \$10.00.

These volumes are the product of studies extending over a period of more than twenty years, in which are incorporated the results of minute and painstaking investigations in a dozen different fields. They are a monument of industry and learning to which American scholars may well point with pride.

This bold undertaking to write the history of experimental science and magic for a period of thirteen centuries was not a part of the author's original plan. The design was to include only the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the time of greatest productivity, but these centuries could not be understood if they were taken out of their setting; they represented only the close of a long development. The author therefore decided to begin with the first century, because Christian thought began then; Pliny's *Natural History* was therefore the logical starting-point. He admits he may have tried to cover too much ground and may have been guilty of serious omissions. This might be a matter for regret if the present volumes were to be regarded as the last word on

¹ Cf. *Class. Phil.*, VIII, 502; X, 231.

the subject. In point of fact, they simply open up a large field, hitherto too much neglected, and furnish material and stimulus for further research.

The philologist will find something to criticize in the chapters dealing with the Roman authors. He will have to be convinced that any translation made by Riley (Bohn) is a good one (I, 42, n. 2); he will not approve of the practice of citing Pliny by the antiquated notation of Harduin (not Hardouin) and others and "preferred in the English translation of Bostock and Riley." Keil's edition of Pliny's *Letters* is cited, instead of Kukula's, Haase's edition of Seneca instead of Hosius', and Giles' edition of Aldhelm instead of Ehwald's.

It is to be hoped that the chapters on Pliny's *Natural History* will renew an interest in the study of that writer. Thorndyke describes him as (I, 42) as "perhaps the most important single source extant for the history of ancient civilization." The present neglect of the *Natural History* is in sharp contrast with the interest displayed during the last quarter of the last century. We still lack a reliable edition of the text. The statement (I, 46) that "possibly he had not read all the writers mentioned in his bibliographies" could safely be made stronger. In his Preface, Pliny states that he used 2,000 volumes of 100 authors, but he lists 140 Roman and 327 foreign authors in his bibliographies. We have here probably a distinction between main and occasional sources, but we need not assume that Pliny knew them all at first hand. Pliny's famous collection of notebooks was pretty surely not the first of its kind, and from the fact that he was offered the sum of 400,000 sesterces for it, while it was still incomplete, it might be inferred that there was a market for such books.

Thorndyke often gives us a hint as to the popularity of an author by pointing out the number of MSS that have survived; this is one of the best criteria that we have for measuring the extent to which an author was used and for tracing cultural movements. In the case of Pliny it is not enough merely to say that the MSS are numerous. We do not know how many there are, because no one has ever taken the trouble to make the investigation. Over two hundred, however, are known, which puts him in the same class as Horace and Juvenal, among the most popular writers in the Middle Ages. The statement (I, 51) that the MSS of Pliny are "in a scarcely legible condition owing to corrections and emendations which enhance the obscurity of the text and perhaps do Pliny a grave injustice in other respects" is not quite accurate. The palimpsests and fragments are frequently illegible but in the main the MSS can be read. The difficulties of the text are in most cases not caused by correction and emendation, except in the late MSS, but by the errors of the scribes who were dealing with so many unfamiliar words and with such difficult subject-matter. The text still suffers from the fact that the modern editors have not exhausted their MS material and have shown too little knowledge of paleography.

There is little reason for doubting that the *Halieutica* which our author says is not extant (I, 74) has come down to us substantially in the form in

which Pliny knew it. At any rate, the fishes mentioned by Pliny and credited to Ovid coincide, with one or two exceptions, with those contained in the fragment of 130 hexameters, which has been preserved in the Vienna MS 277, with the title *Versus Ovidi de piscibus et feris*; the order in which they are mentioned is, in the main, the same. The last fish (*acipenser*) in Pliny's citation occurs in the last line of the fragment. There are three possible explanations: (1) the verses are by Ovid, for which we have Pliny's evidence and that of the superscription in the MS. This is the view generally accepted. (2) The verses were written before Pliny's time, and falsely attributed to Ovid. This theory finds some support from certain peculiarities of diction and irregularities in the meter. (3) The verses were composed by a later writer from the material furnished by the two Pliny passages and were foisted on Ovid—a totally gratuitous assumption which completely disregards the evidence.

There are a few minor slips in the chapters dealing with Pliny. Pliny does not "deplore" the spitefulness of dogs (p. 75); he says, "*notata est*"; we read (p. 76), "Pliny somewhere informs us," but our author gives the exact citation in the footnote; page 78, "again he should remove every stitch of clothing and even his rings" is the version for Pliny's *solutus vinculo omni cinctus et calceatus atque etiam anuli*; on page 599 from a *Precatio omnium herbarum*, sometimes found at the beginning of the *Herbarium* of the Pseudo-Apuleius, we have a different rendering of what is obviously the same passage, "The person must be barefoot, ungirded, chaste, and wear no ring"; page 93, the translation does not conform to the text; "He informs us that ocimum is sown with curses and maledictions and that when cummin seed is rammed down (!) into the soil the sowers pray it not to come up"; the Latin is, *cum maledictis ac probis serendum (ocimum) praecipiant, ut laetius proveniat; sato pavitur terra. Et cuminum qui serunt precantur ne exeat*; on page 99 Thrasyllus is authority for all the three statements in the passage, and the word "that" should be repeated with the second and third clauses.

On page 463, footnote 7, it might be noted that Dardanus, as well as Damigeron, is mentioned in the Apuleius citation, and that they are mentioned together also by Arnobius (*Adv. nationes* i. 52). Dardanus is referred to also by Columella. It might appear ungracious to one who has given us so much to express the wish that Columella had been included in the author's survey; he is referred to only twice, in the footnotes. The list of MSS of Ambrose's *Hexaameron* (p. 484, n. 3) might easily be enlarged; I have noted the following: Bodley 86 (XII), 209 (XII), 751 (XII); Cheltenham 369 (XII), 487 (XII); Cambridge, Trinity College (XI); Holkham Hall 122 (XII); Lambeth Palace 373 (XII), Helmington Hall (XII). In the literature on the *Hexaameron*, Robbins' (Chicago) dissertation, *The Hexaemeral Literature*, should have been included; and under *Synesius* (p. 540), Kissling's (Chicago) dissertation, *The Philosophy of Synesius of Cyrene*.

Thorndyke is scarcely just to Suetonius when he asks (p. 601, n. 3): "But after all is Suetonius any more respectable a historian than Aethicus and Soli-

nus are geographers?" But the activity of Solinus is limited largely to the scissors and paste pot. He shows his independence apparently only in varying the phrases of his source, the result of which has been to enrich the language with a considerable number of new words.

Of especial interest is the author's discussion of the *Florilegia* (p. 618). He objects to the view that mediaeval writers did not have the works of the classical writers they use and cite, but depended on anthologies. He argues that *Florilegia* did not exist in impressive numbers, and is under the impression that the authors included in them were the ones most used in complete texts. From extant MSS he concludes that the whole matter of *Florilegia* is of very slight importance, and that the theory based upon them is a survival of the prejudice of the classical Renaissance against "the Dark Ages." Later (II, 404) he recurs to the subject. He asks: "Why should mediaeval writers take their citations at second hand?" The original writers were fairly accessible, he argues, the earliest MSS are almost invariably mediaeval, and probably they had many more copies that are now destroyed and possibly some originals that are now lost. These arguments are, in the main, reasonable and the conclusions are probably sound, but they do not amount to a demonstration, as is claimed in the author's summary (II, 971), which is quoted below. The "myth" cannot be disposed of until we know definitely how many MSS there are, when and where they were written, and what is in them. This is a piece of research that should have been done long ago. That we may soon expect a solution of the problem we owe to Professor Rand and his student Miss Sanford, who has just finished a dissertation on the subject. She has found five hundred MSS—more than might have been expected, though the number is small when compared with the total number of the complete MSS of our classical texts. It must be remembered, however, that the mortality among MSS containing anthologies is much higher than in the case of complete texts.

In his discussion of Isidore, which is cited from the edition of Arevalo instead of Lindsay's, the author might have given a clearer impression of the extraordinary popularity of this writer if he had been familiar with the reviewer's *Isidorstudien*. No Latin text, except the Bible, can show such an amazing number of old MSS (about four hundred, including fragments, before the middle of the ninth century, many of them containing only excerpts). Thorndyke is not too severe in his strictures on Isidore and his influence (p. 623). His remarks (p. 624) on the power of generalization, of terse expression and telling use of words shown in the *Etymologies* are probably too complimentary. Isidore is the artist par excellence of the scissors and paste pot. He recognized a neat generalization or a terse expression when he saw it and often showed an uncanny skill in combining the disjointed sentences into a mosaic.¹ It may be added that Hrabanus' account of magic (p. 630, n. 2) is

¹ Cf. Traube, "Die Geschichte der Tironischen Noten bei Suetonius und Isidorus," *Archiv f. Stenographie*, LIII, 191-208.

a combination of Isidore and Augustine (Migne, 110, 1101-07 = Augustine *De divinatione daemonum* 3-10). The passage from Isidore's, *De natura rerum* (p. 633), on the days of the week is also found in the *Etymologies* (v. 30. 8), and is in general agreement with the statement of Servius *ad Aen.* xi. 51. The passage about the waxing and waning of the moon is from Ambrosius' *Hexameron* (iv. 7. 29), and the comparison of the moon and the church is from the same source (iv. 8. 32). The reference in footnote 3 should be "xxiii" instead of "xxii," and in footnote 5 the section number should be "13" instead of "15."

The labels of the seven-branched candlestick mentioned on page 676 are taken from the seven gifts of the spirit (Isa. 11:2). It would be appropriate enough that Cassiodore should be the first writer to use the word *modernus* (II. 25), but the word occurs in the writings of two of his older contemporaries, Ennodius and Priscian.

Two of the best examples of fine philological and historical method are the author's analysis of the evidence bearing on the Latin *Physiologus* (I. 497), by which the importance of that text for the history of art is greatly diminished, and his demonstration that Roger Bacon is not the first modern scientific investigator, the result of which is considerably to reduce the size and brilliance of the halo with which many modern scholars have invested him.

An excellent summary concludes the work. The following passage from it is the one of most interest to the classical student (II, 971):

I have exposed the *Physiologus* myth, the *Florilegia* myth, the legend of Roger Bacon as a lone herald of modern experimental science, the notion that Vincent of Beauvais adequately sums up all mediaeval science, and a number of other modern "vulgar errors" concerning mediaeval learning. I have shown that mediaeval men were wider readers than has often been thought, that the scholastics presented their material in a more systematic way than classical writers, that the Latin of the thirteenth century has a clearer style and shows more direct thinking than the vernaculars of the fifteenth century. Should we, moreover, go on to examine in detail the writings of the early modern centuries, I suspect that we would find them repeating the mediaeval authors just as these had repeated the classical authors. And of the scientific notions with which the men of the sixteenth century have been credited by their admirers many might be found on closer scrutiny and comparison to date back to classical or mediaeval authors.

Each volume is provided with a General Index, a Bibliographical Index, and an Index of MSS (containing over 1,500 items). The proofreading has been carefully done, but *dominos* should be read for *domines* (I, 526), and *taxus* for *tazo* (I, 636). Occasionally the English might be improved, e.g., "shall soon come to a realization that there is more magic in the *Natural History* which is not attributed to the magi than there is that is" (I, 72); "he also as constantly or more fulsomely than Pliny inveighs against the luxury, etc." (I, 101). The author is not afraid of rare, technical, or even obsolete words, e.g., "demeaning" as an adjective (II, 410), "extollation" (II, 534), "estoppal" (*sic*) (II, 972).

CHARLES H. BEESON

Sappho and Her Influence. By DAVID M. ROBINSON. In the series, "Our Debt to Greece and Rome."

There are few writers on subjects connected with classical philology to whom more respectful attention would be given than to Professor Robinson.

One must visit Lesbos to understand Sappho, the island of "clear-voiced nightingales," of golden sunsets and purple hyacinths, the island that produced Terpander, Alcaeus, and Theophrastus, and where Aristotle himself went to recuperate. This Dr. Robinson has done, and by his personal experience in the Aegean Islands, where he quotes Herodotus as saying that the climate is the most beautiful in the world, he has caught the real atmosphere of Sappho's life and poems. He can picture daily life there in the terms in which Archilochus of Paros describes it, "famous figs and the life of the sea."

Dr. Robinson's work is exhaustive, based upon material collected during the last twenty-five years, and he presents both the real Sappho and the Sappho of popular opinion, as she has appeared in the literature of the civilized world. He calls her one of the greatest if not the greatest poet who has ever lived.

We are thrilled at the picture which Dr. Robinson gives of Sappho at the head of her school in Mytilene, a *thiasos* to Aphrodite, a sacred guild. He does not, unfortunately, take up the subject of the definite constitution of this *thiasos*, a matter of especial interest since recent discoveries, but he makes Sappho's position of honor in Mytilene very plain, and vindicates her purity of character. He calls her school a woman's college, where dancing, music, and the technique of poetry were taught, and states that there were other schools of the same type in Mytilene, but probably inferior.

In the age of Pittacus, Mytilene was at her best, and Sappho's influence there is fully demonstrated by Dr. Robinson both by his classical knowledge in general, and particularly by reference to the fragments discovered at Oxyrhynchus and elsewhere. He ranks her with Socrates and Shakespeare, and calls her the possessor of a "planetary mind swinging in its orbit through all the realms of nature, or human nature, or the divine nature of the unseen world."

Dr. Robinson refers to the story of Sappho's brother and Rhodopis. It will be remembered that Herodotus says that Rhodopis sent many *obeloi*, or "iron spits," for roasting oxen to Delphi to be dedicated in the temple, and that they could still be seen there, piled up behind the altar of the Chians. These offerings Dr. Robinson calls "*obeliskoi*," or "iron spits, the small change of ancient days before coin money was used to any great extent." Is this not a confusion of terms?

Professor Robinson gives us a critical résumé of possibilities of a genuine portrait of Sappho. He speaks of the different ways in which her hair is arranged in the statues, and on the coins and vases, referring to the terra cotta from Melos in the British Museum as the oldest figure, dating back to a few

years after her time. I myself have a so-called Sappho coin belonging to the imperial age, on which the hair is arranged as in the terra cotta from Melos, but the type which Dr. Robinson calls the most famous is seen in the statue by Silanion, the Greek sculptor of the fourth century B.C., and he thinks that the face which appears on so-called Sappho coins in Mytilene, with little curls in front and a handkerchief around the head, was copied from Silanion or from an earlier statue. The best type of this head is seen in the bust in the Villa Albani in Rome.

As far as I know, Dr. Robinson is the first scholar to advance the opinion, which all friends of Sappho would welcome, that the beautiful face on early Greek coins of Mytilene, of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., may be Sappho, and not Aphrodité, as has usually been supposed.

The historical estimate of Sappho in different literatures of the world given by Dr. Robinson is almost encyclopedic. It includes the literature of Greece and Rome, of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, as well as Italian, Spanish, German, French, English, and American literature, with a reference also to the Russian. In fact, in the wealth of quotations and range of appreciation, he shows the truth of Sappho's remark: "I say some one will think of us hereafter."

We are especially grateful for a beautiful translation of the *Hymn to Aphrodite* previously unpublished, by Professor Gildersleeve. One general effect of the selections given, however, although many of them are well translated, is to awaken in the mind of the reader the wish that only great poets would attempt to render Sappho's poems in verse, otherwise giving us a prose translation only, of her enchanted words.

One of the finest things in the book is the critical dealing with Sappho in art and music, bringing out very clearly that her poems can never be understood without musical accompaniment, as they were composed, and furthermore, one that makes a lyric delivery possible.

Professor Robinson uses, for the most part, Mr. Edmonds' rendering of the Greek in the newly discovered fragments. One is glad to see that he feels free to criticize it when necessary.

MARY MILLS PATRICK

CONSTANTINOPLE

The "Aeneid" of Virgil. Translated by CHARLES J. BILLSON. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1924.

The translation of the *Aeneid* by Mr. Charles J. Billson is so well and favorably known that a new edition calls for only a brief notice of welcome. The present version represents a pretty thorough revision, but the essential qualities are unchanged.

The blank verse is admirable, and there is no question of the translator's scholarship or literary ability. Whether blank verse is the ideal medium for

rendering Virgil will probably be settled about two weeks after the end of the world.

Of course every reviewer has his favorite touchstone for a translation, and my choice happens to be vi. 268-81. I feel that readers who are not familiar with the older edition will be able to decide far better from the following excerpt than from any words of mine whether they would care to have the book or not.

Darkling they fared, in desolate dim night,
Through Death's void realm of shadows, even as men
Who walk in forests through the ghostly gleams
Of a dour moon, when clouds have veiled the sky,
And every colour in mirk night is quenched.

Before the Porchway, in Hell's very throat,
Lay Grief, and pale Diseases, and Remorse,
And sad old Age, and Want, that counsels ill,
Fear, and gaunt Famine,—dreadful shapes to see!—
And evil Heart's delights. And full in face,
Right in the gateway, lay the Slaughterer, War,
The Furies' iron cells, and Discord wild,
With blood-wet ribbands in her snaky hair.

It is a pleasure to note that the type is kindly to the eye and that the press work is sound.

F. B. R. HELLEMS

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO
BOULDER, COLO.

Royal Blossom or Trisevyene. By KOSTES PALAMAS. Translated by ARISTIDES E. PHOUTRIDES. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1923.

Of two volumes of poetry by that gifted Greek, Kostas Palamas, I have written very cordially in these columns. Of his prose drama, *Royal Blossom or Trisevyene*, I am unable to write in the same tone.

The scene is laid in a seaside village of Greece, and the plot is concerned with the doings and sufferings of Trisevyene, the daughter of a landowner by his first wife. It is a mild and unconvincing bit of Ibsenism, brightened by occasional touches of poetic expression. To the present reviewer it offered a pleasing portrayal of manners and customs, which is exactly what the author did not design, for he expressly states that he is looking for something deeper.

Likewise the men who struggle in this play may not be so much the symbols of a will that offers resolute resistance as they are the playthings of an unreasoning impulse that bursts suddenly into flames to go out the moment afterwards.

There is an Introduction by the author and another by the translator. In the latter Mr. Phoutrides included a very sane review of the drama.

F. B. R. HELLEMS

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO
BOULDER, COLO.

Lyra Graeca. Edited and translated by J. M. EDMONDS. Loeb Classical Library. Three volumes. London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1924.

The second volume of Mr. Edmond's *Lyra Graeca* containing Stesichorus, Ibycus, Anacreon, Telesilla, Simonides, and Timocreon maintains the quality of the first—the printing of all the *testimonia*, the biographical tradition, and the evidence for the texts, the “e.g.” exercises in Greek verse composition to show what the Greek lyrist might, could, would have said and translations substantially correct though not always inspired or close enough to exhibit the construction to the tiro. I have no space to criticize in detail the readings adopted and I am not sure that I could do it fairly. I do not know whether it is sound poetic judgment or mere prejudice and distress at the disturbance of life-long associations that makes me resent in the Thermopylae dirge *πρὸ χρωῶν δὲ μνάστις ὁ δ' οἶνος* (sic) *ἔπαινος* and *οἰκέτιν* (for its keeper) *εὐδοξίαν*, or in the Danae *οἶον ἔχον πόνον οὐ δακρύεις* and *κνωώσεις*, or *τῇδ' Ἀρτεμης, ὦ κόραι* in Telesilla.

In the arrangement of the poem to Scopas he adopts the order of Aars and does not even mention the impossible interpretation of Wilamowitz. He translates “Though it come of a wise man I hold not with the saying of Pittacus,” and renders *κατὰ πλείστον ἀριστον* “and take it all in all, etc.” He keeps from Plato *φιλόμωμος* which I do not think it provable or probable that Simonides used.

The translation is of course in the main correct. I do not believe that *ἀπροφασίστως δουλείοντα* means “in bondage inexcusable” or *ἀπήμαντον δὲ οὐδὲν ἔστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς* “nothing can be got among men without toil,” or *μηδὲν ἁμαρτῶν* “to incur no guilt” or *φῶμυς ἔχῃσι βροτῶν* “is constrained by the talk of men” or *πόλλ' ἀτέλεστα νοεῖ* “deems to have no end.”

The Preface corrects some errors in the first volume.

PAUL SHOREY

Polybius, “*The Histories*.” With an English translation by W. R. PATON. Six volumes. Volume III. London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1923. Loeb Classical Library.

The third volume of Paton's *Polybius* covering Books v–viii shows no falling off from the first two volumes reviewed in *Classical Philology* (XVIII,

¹ Cf. *Class. Phil.*, XVIII. 188.

277). Mr. Paton evidently understood the Greek and made few if any appreciable mistakes. The editors, however, should not have let pass the oversight that attributes

ὄρῳ τὸ δῖον οὐ βέλος διέπτει;

to the talent of Samus, son of Chrysogonus! The verse is from Euripides' *Supplikes* 860, and does not mean "Seest thou how far the bolt divine hath sped?" but "Seest thou [yon corpse] where through leapt Zeus' bolt?" The talent of Samus was the wit ἐπιδειξιότης of his apt and perhaps punning quotation of the verse. Mr. Paton, as I said before, does not attempt to reproduce the idiosyncrasies of Polybius' atrocious journalistic and pseudo-scientific style. He translates Polybius' meaning into the fluent, lucid, idiomatic English of a good modern historian.

There are no notes on the text except that in v. 24. 5 the translator adds μή, rightly I think.

PAUL SHOREY

Anthologia Lyrica. Edited by E. DIEHL. I. *Poetae Elegiaci*; II. *Theognis, Carmen Aureum, Phocylidea*; III. *Iamborum Scriptores*; IV. *Poetae Melici, Monodia*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1922-23.

The new Teubner *Anthologia Lyrica* is an indispensable supplement or complement to Edmonds' *Lyra Graeca*. It does not give the lives and *testimonia* in full or reconstruct whole poems from the prose of Himerius or Athenaeus, but supplies the evidence for the text, and in addition much more fully than Edmonds an immense commentary of references to parallel passages, ancient lexicographers and scholiasts, and the work of modern scholars. These useful little volumes are marvels of condensation and compactness. It is a pity that our post-bellum poverty necessitates so small a format, such close spacing, and such fine print. I have been using the book a few weeks rather superficially in the classroom and find it a great convenience, but also a great strain on the eyes and a teasing text to teach. This announcement must take the place for the present of a critical examination which to be of any value would demand more space, more time, and more costly Greek printing than we can afford.

PAUL SHOREY

Aristophanes. With the English translation of BENJAMIN BICKLEY ROGERS. Loeb Classical Library. In three volumes. London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1924.

Not the least of the many services of the editors of the "Loeb Series" to classical scholarship is the making Rogers' incomparable translation of *Aristophanes* accessible to students who could not afford to pay for the eleven large volumes of the original. They have added as a fitting tribute to the leader of Aristophanic studies in America the late John Williams White's Introduc-

tion to Dr. Loeb's translation of Maurice Croiset's *Aristophanes and the Political Parties at Athens*. Brief introductions to the several plays and foot-notes original or abbreviated from Rogers convey succinctly the minimum of stage directions and explanations of puns, parodies, personal and political allusions indispensable to the understanding and enjoyment of the text. Full indexes to each volume make all this material accessible.

From no writer can more be learned about the actual, as opposed to the rhetorically or sentimentally idealized, "Greek view of life" than from Aristophanes, who at the same time, as Lowell says, is nearer to us than is Molière. Never before has the approach to Aristophanes been made so easy. And these useful volumes will do more for the diffusion of real intelligence about the Greeks than scores of generalized essays about the Greek genius and the achievement of Greece.

PAUL SHOREY

Stoicism and Its Influence. By R. M. WENLEY. "Our Debt to Greece and Rome Series." Boston: Marshall Jones Company, 1924.

This little volume is no exception to the rule that Professor Wenley is always interesting and provocative of thought. There would be little profit in and the limits prescribed for this series preclude another résumé of the facts and philology of Stoicism amply set forth in Zeller. What Professor Wenley presents in its stead is a broad sketch of the history and significance of Stoicism set in a framework of the philosophy of history or history of philosophy. I cannot differ from him except in opinion. By this I mean that though he repudiates them in the first sentence of his Preface he is aware of the facts and reasons that make me regard Stoicism for all its pretensions, its elaborations of pseudo-scientific terminology, and its four hundred years' domination of Graeco-Roman philosophy as being what I also believe Kantianism to be from the point of view of world-literature and world-thought a second-rate episode. He virtually concedes the postulates of this opinion when he admits that Zeno the Semite was anything but a man of ideas, and that no single thinker of the first rank emerges in the history of Stoicism. But for him the actual influence of the Stoics and the persistence or perpetual re-emergence of the Stoic monism, the Stoic temper, the Stoic attitude toward life counter-balance this intellectual and aesthetic deficiency.

I think he sometimes exaggerates this influence by overlooking the shrewd observation in Cicero that all the Stoic paradoxes are Socratic or, as Gilfillan puts it, more discriminatingly, as well as more picturesquely: "The Stoic was only the stony similitude of a Platonist." After Marcus Aurelius, who is half a Platonist, I should want the distinct evidence of terminology to confirm alleged Stoic influences. And I should not rely overmuch on that. Not everyone today who lapses sometimes into the patter of Herbert Spencer or Freud is to be classed as a Spencerian or Freudian. I think it is straining the evi-

dence to find so much Stoicism as Professor Wenley does in Boethius' *Consolation of Philosophy*. I should rather look to Plato's *Gorgias*. But it would be fairer to thrash these dissenting opinions out in conversation with Professor Wenley than by dwelling on them here to risk conveying a wrong impression of the breadth, sanity, power of generalization, pertinency of allusion, and piquancy of expression of this admirable contribution to a useful series.

PAUL SHOREY

Language and Philology. By ROLAND G. KENT. "Our Debt to Greece and Rome Series." Boston: Marshall Jones Company, 1924.

An interesting summary account of the classical elements in English, the debt of the English language to Greece and Rome. The book is no mere collection of statistics, though these are not lacking, but gives a well-arranged analysis and classification of the facts and influences, with much useful information on the principles of word-formation. The preparation of even such a brief manual requires vastly more labor and care in avoiding pitfalls than the laymen will probably realize.

C. D. B.

Compounds of the Word "Cow." A Study in Semantics. By ALFRED PORTER HAMILTON. Philadelphia, 1923.

This University of Pennsylvania thesis contains an exhaustive list of compounds of *cow* and its cognates. Its interest and justification lie in the various nuances which the "cow"-element may show, as "strong," "large," "coarse," "wild," etc., which are briefly noted on page 48.

C. D. B.

Manuel de linguistique grecque. By ALBERT CARNOY. Paris: Louvain, 1924. Pp. 423.

The well-known Belgian scholar, whose productivity embraces such diverse fields as Romance phonology and Iranian mythology, aims at a description of the mechanism of the Greek language in the light of historical grammar and general linguistics, and in a less technical and complicated form than is followed in other manuals of similar object. The book is distinctly readable and may well serve to initiate the classical student in matters of general linguistic importance and in many leading aspects of the historical development in Greek. It is an excellent book for introductory reading. For any detailed study it would be found too sketchy and less convenient for practical use than the dryer but more systematic treatment in other handbooks. Many details of elementary importance are left untouched, and there are a few positive errors. For example, in putting $\phi\alpha\nu\text{-}\acute{\iota}\omega$: $\phi\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ and $\tau\epsilon\nu\text{-}\acute{\iota}\omega$: $\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ under the

same head (*umlaut, épenhèse*) on page 46, the author has fallen into an error which any student may avoid by a glance at Smyth's *Greek Grammar*, §§ 32a, 96, or Goodwin, § 84.5, 6. In *τείνω* there is no real diphthongization as in *φαίνω*, but the lengthening, as in *κλίνω* from *κλιν-ω* or *ἀμύνω* from *ἀμυν-ω*, which the author does not cover.

C. D. B.

Septuaginta-Fragmente unter den Papyri Osloenses. By GUNNAR RUDBERG. (From *Videnskapsselskapets Forhandlinger* for 1923.) Christiania, 1923.

Professor Gunnar Rudberg here publishes two fragments, each giving on recto and verso portions of a column of text from a papyrus book of the Septuagint. The columns of this book were very narrow, each line containing only ten to fifteen letters, with wide margins. Rudberg regards this book's format, with its widely margined pages, as a type taken over by the church from editions of profane literature. It represents what was then considered (the script is of the fifth century) to be a pretentious edition. The editor thinks that this text-form, written with narrow columns, became a definite tradition in reproducing texts for liturgical use. Probably this format was established originally by a particular book-publishing firm or school of copyists.

WILLIAM LINN WESTERMANN

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Die kleineren Historikerfragmente auf Papyrus. By FR. BILABEL. Bonn: Marcus und Weber, 1923. Pp. 64.

In collecting this group of fourteen new fragments from the works of ancient historians and chronologists, Bilabel has selected only small and otherwise inaccessible pieces. Most of these have already appeared in the volumes of papyri or lie imbedded in ponderous *Sitzungsberichte* and *Memoirs*. Two of the pieces are hitherto unpublished, a fragment of an epitome of Manetho and about forty lines of a Berlin fragment. In the Berlin fragment the unknown author expresses the conviction that self-interest has usually been the political motivation of help given in dire need by one Greek city-state to another. A fragment of great importance both to teachers of Livy and to ancient historians is that from the *Deeds of Hannibal* written by Sosylus, Hannibal's teacher of Greek and his personal companion. It describes a naval battle between the Roman and Carthaginian fleets in 217 B.C., in which the Massiliot contingent of the Roman fleet comes in for high praise. Bilabel has done a useful service in putting these fragments together in convenient and cheap form. It is a critical edition, equipped with full commentary and index. In numerous places Bilabel offers new restorations and new readings. Many of these are his own.

WILLIAM LINN WESTERMANN

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Griechische Urkunden der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Vol. I, Part 3. By PAUL M. MEYER. Leipzig: Teubner, 1924.

With the printing of this third part of the Hamburg Greek papyri, Professor Paul M. Meyer has brought to completion the first volume of that collection, a task begun some fifteen years ago. This part, therefore, includes the complete indexes to the entire volume. It is encouraging to note that, in addition to the financial support obtained in Germany, contributions have been obtained for the publication of these papyri from Dutch and American organizations which are interested in the continuation of scientific work. The effects of the war upon Germany appear in this fascicle in the saving of space by use of smaller type, both in the Greek text and in the commentary; in the fact that the original texts are not reproduced by separate lines but in continuous printing; and in the maximum compression of the commentary consistent with clarity. But the fine and complete scholarship of the editor is unimpaired.

The sixty numbers here presented by Meyer are chiefly legal, economic, or administrative documents, with a few private letters. In point of time they range from 274-273 B.C. (one of the two earliest extant fragments from the Zenon archive) into the sixth Christian century. Translations into German are not given. No fragments of ancient literature are included. As in all publications of papyri lots, the importance and interest of the single documents vary. Number 60, a declaration of persons from Hermopolis Magna of the year 90 A.D., brings additional proof of the fact established by Eger,¹ that the personal census declarations of that period in Egypt also served as a check upon the real property owned in cities and towns by each house-dweller. A Fayum document of the year 123 A.D. (No. 62) is an official report of the sale by a woman of some catocic land. She sells one-half of a plot belonging to her and the purchaser also takes one-half of a small holding of the state domain which the vendor has had previously assigned to her by the village in which she lives. It is a further early example of compulsory hereditary assignment of unoccupied state domain, the *ἐπιβολή* which after Diocletian became so heavy a burden upon the agricultural population of the Empire. Meyer seems to follow Oertel's separation of this compulsory assignment to small landholders into three types,² namely, official allotment of land parcels to the peasants (*διαίσεις*); general allotment to villages of land in their own or in neighboring village districts (*ἐπιμερισμός*); and the assignment to the *proximi quique possessores* (*ἐπιβολή*). I doubt that this is correct. The compulsory acceptance of her parcel of state domain by the woman vendor in Meyer's *P. Ham.* (62) is called in this very document both an *ἐπιβολή κώμης* (l. 5) and "an allotment to her from the division" of the state domain, *ἐπικεκληροκό-*

¹ *Grundbuchwesen*, pp. 181 f.

² *Liturgie*, pp. 94-107.

των αὐτῇ ἐγ διαιρέσεως (l. 4). For the present I would suggest the following explanation as a better working hypothesis than that adopted by Meyer. This is all one thing. The village receives a total allotment, called ἐπιβολὴ κώμης or ἐπιμερισμός, of unoccupied state domain. The village officials then assign it in parcels to the villagers and this part of the official action is presented by the ἐπικεκληροκότων ἐκ διαιρέσεως of Meyer's document. The *adsignatio* to the nearest *possessores* seems to be the compulsory assignment of large tracts to big landowners, which probably did not arise until the time of Constantine. This suggestion approaches that offered by Wicken in *Grundzüge*.¹

No. 72 is a Latin text, of the second or third century, of unusual character, here re-edited by Meyer. It gives the legal formulas, or models, for different sections of wills which are to be made out according to the Roman law. The second of the four sections which are preserved shows that the *lex Fufia Caninia* of 2 B.C., regarding testamentary manumission, still prevailed. It provided that only a certain part of the slaves, a number decreasing with the increasing number of the slaves owned, could be manumitted in the will. Most important is the certainty brought by this document of the existence of such collections of legal formulas.

The collection includes thirteen fragments (Nos. 105-17) from the Zenon archive of the third century B.C. Number 114 is an account of workmen employed, two each day, at some type of labor which is not named. The wage paid them is $1\frac{1}{2}$ *obols* for one and $\frac{1}{2}$ *obol* for the other. This must be for a workman and assistant; and the total corresponds closely to the 1-*obol* payment for heavy farm labor and $\frac{1}{2}$ *obol* for lighter work of the Zenon farm account in P. Wisconsin 1 published by Westermann and Laird.²

Meyer's readings of the papyri are careful and scholarly. His control of the juristic documents is particularly splendid.

WILLIAM LINN WESTERMANN

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Lettere Christiane dai Papiri Greci del III e IV Secolo. By GUISEPPE GHEDINI. Milan: Press of "Aegyptus," 1923. Pp. xxviii+376.

This is the first collection of papyri devoted solely to letters of Egyptian Christians which has appeared. The rapidly increasing number of the letters necessitated the chronological limitation by the editor to the two centuries stretching from the end of the second to the beginning of the fourth century. No *libelli* of the persecutions or other public documents are included; and no new or unpublished letters appear. The edition is equipped with a complete critical apparatus including an introduction upon the epistolary form, religious sentiments and expressions, the ecclesiastical hierarchy of Egypt, and

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 292-98.

² *Journal of Egypt Archaeology*, IX, 81-90.

other useful comments. Restorations and critical comments upon the texts of the letters show the excellent technique which was to be expected of a pupil of Aristide Calderini. About forty pages of observations upon grammatical usage and morphology precede the indexes. A supplementary Index gives the citations from the Old and New Testaments which appear in the letters. Naturally enough, the New Testament citations heavily prevail. The editor, in addition to his good scholarship, displays a sympathetic appreciation of the serenity of mind, the gentleness, and the simplicity of character which distinguishes so many of these early Christian letters. His sympathetic approach to the joys and the little tragedies¹ of these early Christians gives to Ghedini's book a certain distinction. It will be found most useful to all who are interested in early Christian spirit and life.

WILLIAM LINN WESTERMANN

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Nicolaus of Damascus "Life of Augustus." A historical commentary embodying a translation by CLAYTON MORRIS HALL. "Smith College Classical Studies," Volume IV, 1923.

Nicolaus' *Life of Augustus* is a more grateful subject for the historical commentator than for the translator. For Nicolaus, though lacking the impartiality and critical judgment of the historian, had at least the unique advantage of friendship with the emperor and access to his private memoirs. But the biographer's rambling and often obscure Greek if it is to be made into readable English requires free and deft handling. In this Mr. Hall has not always succeeded. Too close adherence to his original, at times, betrays him into English so pedantic as "settled securely not only the tribes of the Greeks and barbarians but also their dispositions" or anacoluthic sentences such as "The boy being his companion . . . and seeing . . . and having . . . when . . . , looking out for the opportune moment, he respectfully asked. . . ." In a few instances he has, I believe, also misread the Greek. *οποι πορευθείη* (3) should be read literally as "where he went" not "how far he had advanced" and *πλὴν ὅποι καὶ πρότερον* (4) as "except where he had gone before" not "other than as he did before." In 14 *πολλὴ δ' ἐγένετο σπουδὴ καὶ τῶν συνόντων αὐτῷ πολιτῶν πειθομένων εἶναι παῖδα Μαρίου*, the translation, "the citizens who accompanied him were also earnestly persuaded that he was Marius' son," fails to indicate that the *σπουδὴ* of the citizens was active—an enthusiastic support of the claimant to kinship. It was this, above all, that placed Augustus *ἐν ἀπορίᾳ δυνῇ* which the mild "in quite a quandary" of the translator hardly describes. In the same paragraph Mr. Hall translates *ὑπάρχων εὐθὺς αὐτῷ καὶ σφᾶς τοῖς τε ἄλλοις οἰκείοις πεπεισμένους . . .*, "Then both they and the other relations would accede to his decision quite convinced" (with Müller's Latin paraphrase *eius auctoritati accessuros*).

¹ See Letter XXIX = *P. Grenf.*, I, 53.

missing the force of *ὑπάρχων πεπεισμένους*, a strong perfect as in Demosth. xxx. 15 and 190, and the reference of *αὐτῷ* to the claimant, not Caesar. *παρὼν τοῖς πραττομένοις καιροφυλάκειν* (17) implies merely watchful waiting on the scene of action not "to participate in whatever was done." "To join with him in his struggle for power" conveys the meaning of *συναγωνίζειν* (18) more nearly than "to win the power." In 19 *διέξειμι καθ' ὅτι ἐγένετο καὶ ὅπως, τὰς τε αἰτίας ὑφ' ὧν συντάσσα τοσόνδε ἐπεξήλθε* the translation, "I shall rehearse the circumstances of the plot itself, its reasons and its final momentous outcome," overlooks *ὅπως* and the connection of *τὰς αἰτίας* with its dependent clause. Of the Pompeians Nicolaus writes (19) *οὐδὲ καίπερ Καίσαρος φιλανθρώπως προσαγομένου ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ τὸ δύσελπι αὐτῷ ἀφηροῦντο*, the latter part of which is translated, "They never abandoned their hope of doing him harm." The meaning of *δύσελπις* is explained by Aristotle *Eth.* iii. 7. *δύσελπις δὴ τις ὁ δειλός· πάντα γὰρ φοβεῖται*, an interpretation well suited to this passage. The Pompeians despite Caesar's assurances of friendship never ceased to be apprehensive. Again, in (19) *αἰτίαι δ' αὐτοὺς ἐνήγον ἐπιχειρεῖν τ' ἀνδρὶ οὐκ ἀπὸ μικρῶν διαφορῶν ἰδίᾳ τε ἑκάστοις καὶ κοινῇ πᾶσι γεγονέναι* the misinterpretation of the prepositional phrase in the translation, "There were various reasons which affected each and all of them and impelled them . . ." destroys the chief point of the sentence. A similar use of this phrase in 26B *οὐ γὰρ ἀπὸ γεγονέναι* shows that Nicolaus must mean here that the motives which were impelling them to the attack were not inspired by slight dissensions that each had with him privately or publicly. *τῆς ἑαυτοῦ γλώττης* (21) must be equivalent to *κατὰ γλῶσσαν τὴν σφετέρην* Thuc. iii. 112 "in their own tongue," not "in chorus." In support of his translation of (24) *ἤπτετο τῆς ἀναβολῆς καὶ τι θρασύτερον εἶσω τὰς χεῖρας ἔχοντας ἰδοὺ δρᾶν*, "He seized Caesar's toga seeming to act rather boldly for a suppliant," Mr. Hall quotes Plaut *Amph.* 257, *velatis orant*, but no Greek parallel. Sittl (*Die Gebärden der Griechen und Römer*, pp. 7 f.) points out that *εἶσω τὰς χεῖρας ἔχειν* is regularly used by the Greeks to describe that *σῶφρον σχῆμα* so long admired both in ancient Athens and Rome. Aristides criticizes his own day for its departure from this good old custom (contr. *Tim.* 25) *ὥστε ὁ νυνὶ πάντες ἐν ἔθει πράττομεν τὸ τὴν χεῖρα ἔχοντες λέγειν τότε τοῦτο θρασύ τι ἰδοὺ εἶναι*, a passage of which Nicolaus phraseology seems to be reminiscent. Demosthenes (*de fals. legat.* 255) plays upon the phrase in his famous retort, *οὐ λέγειν εἶσω τὴν χεῖρ' ἔχοντ' Αἰσχύνῃ δει ἀλλὰ πρεσβεῖν εἶσω τὴν χεῖρ' ἔχοντα*. Nicolaus' meaning must be that Cimber seemed to be acting too boldly for a dignified Roman.

Many seeming inaccuracies in translation are due to a confusion of texts. Mr. Hall, through printing the text of Dindorf, *Historici Graeci Minores*, on the opposite page, has in several passages followed in his translation the variant reading of Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, without advising the reader of the change in text. *κίνδυνον ἢ (καὶ M.) . . . ἀπέχθειαν οἷς οὐκ ἔμελλεν ἀρεστὸς φανείσθαι εἰ (καὶ M.) τοσούδε ὀνόματος παραχωρήσειεν*

(*παραχωρήσεν* M.) 18 is the text, but the translation reads ". . . danger and enmity of men whom he did not care to please. Nor did he propose to cede to anyone a name . . ." (with Müller's Latin rendering *quibus minime gratus videri, neque cuique tanto cedere nomine . . . volebat*). A still wider divergence of text and translation occurs in the chapter (xxi) on the famous incident at the Lupercalia where *βοῶντος δὲ τοῦ δήμου ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τιθέναι* (*τίθεται* M.) *καὶ τοῦτο* (*τοῦτον* M.) *Λέπιδον καλοῦντος . . . ὁ μὲν ὠκνεῖ ἐν τούτῳ δὲ Κάσσιος . . . ὑποφθὰς ἀνείλετο τὸ διάδημα καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ γόνατα αὐτοῦ ἔθηκε* is translated, "Amid the cheers of the crowd he placed it on Caesar's head. Thereupon Caesar called Lepidus to ward him off, but Lepidus hesitated. In the meanwhile Cassius . . . hurriedly removed the diadem and placed it on Caesar's lap." This version, which follows Müller's text, destroys the effect of Nicolaus' climactic description of the elevation of the crown from Caesar's feet to his knees and then finally to his head. *ὑποφθὰς* (anticipating the action of Lepidus) and the improbable change of reference of *καλοῦντος* are also against it. Keeping Dindorf's text and translating, "when the people shouted to place the crown on his head and called to Lepidus to do this," we removed the discrepancy between Nicolaus' and Cicero's (*Phil.* v. 38) accounts of the conduct of Lepidus on which the translator comments without noting that according to his own text they are in agreement. A passage in 27 presents a still more confused tangle of texts and translation. The text reads *συνέρρειον δὲ ἤδη πολλοὶ κατὰ τε οἶκτον καὶ φιλότῃα καὶ κέρδη ἴδια, οἱ ἐκ νεωτερισμοῦ ἐρῶντες*. Mr. Hall adopts *ἐκ*, the emendation of Schwartz, *Herm.* xxxiii. 184, but does not make the necessary change to *ὀρῶντες* with Schwartz or *εὐρῶντες* with Müller nor omit *οἱ* with both. The translation, "Accordingly many joined the consuls out of compassion and friendship, finding a chance for private gain as well as what would result from a revolution," requires the omission of *οἱ*, the reading *εὐρῶντες*, and the insertion of *καί* before *ἐκ*. But of these radical variations there is no hint in text or notes.

GENEVA MISENER

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Das Schicksal als poetische Idee bei Homer. By DR. P. ENGELBERT EBERHARD. Paderborn, 1923.

Dr. Eberhard opens again the discussion on the meaning of Fate in Homer, its relation to the Homeric deities, and its general religious and philosophical significance. His introductory sections set forth the linguistic aspects of the case, and give a useful summary of previous opinions, arranged in such climactic order as to lead up effectively to the views which he proposes to expound.

He belongs to that school of critics which attributes to Homer a high degree of conscious poetic art, an *epische Technik* of his own. He quotes

for his purposes the analogy of those who show that the culture and religion of the Homeric *epos* are not historic but the backward reflection of a later age, and that the literary artistry is not the mark of the rude beginning, but rather of the culminating point in the development of the epic. More specifically, he recalls the views of Römer, Mülher, and Drerup, who maintain that the divine apparatus of the poems is not primarily religious in purpose, but a means of motivation, a *technisches Hilfsmittel*. And so he proposes to treat the Homeric Fate. This latter is the "better knowledge" of the poet, "the concentrated poetic Idea" according to which the action is evolved. In spite of a careful handling of inner, psychological motivation, Homer yet chose to clothe the more ultimate motivation of the poems in the supernatural dress. A background of Fate found favor in the eyes of the Greeks; so much so that Aristototele held up the Fate-tragedy as the ideal form. Fate, then, in Homer serves this large, technical purpose, and is useful as well in binding together the loose structure of events in the narrative.

The disputed relation between Moira and the will of Zeus Dr. Eberhard endeavors to clear up by applying the foregoing principle in some detail to the action of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Throughout the *Iliad* the will of Zeus is represented by his promise to Thetis; by his promise to Athene in the *Odyssey*. Fate, on the other hand, is the "poetic justice" so to speak, which calls for a certain evolution of the action. Zeus's ambiguous attitude toward Greeks and Trojans is explained by the conflict between his sympathies and his engagements to Thetis. Then, to put it briefly, when Zeus wavers, Fate, or the poetic Idea, steps in to order the action as it must rightly go. All the events of the poem are determined step by step in accordance with the will of Zeus, and the more fundamental *Motivierung* of Moira. The rôles of the other gods are adapted to this scheme. The notion of *ὑπέροπον*, unintelligible if Fate be considered as something material, and not as a poetic Idea, bears out this interpretation. It is a counter-motif, which at once throws into relief the ground plan of the poem and shows us the poet's complete grasp of the principle on which he shapes the course of the action. In the *Odyssey*, it is Fate or the poetic Idea which necessitates all the stages of Odysseus' journey and justifies all the vicissitudes through which he is called upon to pass. As in the *Iliad*, Fate is superior to the gods when the *Komposition* demands it. Strictly, then, it is neither above nor below the gods; it is the *poetische Gesamtvorsehung*: 'the gods are the means of its working out; and both serve above all poetico-technical ends.

The study concludes with some brief notice of the Homeric doctrine of free will, and the origin of the concept Fate. In Homer, mortals are responsible for their actions. The gods are guarantors of a moral order in the world. *Μόρος*. Is the limit imposed upon man; *ὑπέροπον* is an infringement of this necessary limitation. Odysseus' career exemplifies this principle. By blinding the Cyclops he overstepped his bounds, and his trials are the fitting penalty. An aesthetic as well as a moral purpose is served by so representing his

fortunes. Odysseus becomes, not a passive figure, but an active one who enlists our sympathies. He is the tragic hero with the tragic fault. A brief account of Moira as death, and of the cults of the Moirae introduces the final section on the origin of the concept Fate. This arises from the time-idea. It is connected with the observation of the march of days, years, and seasons (especially pertinent to a seafaring people), and of the sure advent of the hour of death. The moon, the *Horae*, and the *Moirae* were at first mingled into one general notion; then *Moira* became specialized to apply more particularly to birth and death.

The study opens the thirteenth volume of the series entitled "Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums," under the editorship of Professors Drerup, Grimme, and Kirsch.

HERMANN L. TRACY

UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

Thessalische Dialektgeographie. By R. VAN DER VELDE. Utrecht, 1924. Pp. 182.

This Utrecht dissertation, like Kieckers' *Die lokalen Verschiedenheiten im Dialekte Kretas*, is an attempt to apply to an ancient Greek dialect the methods of linguistic geography, which are so much in vogue in the study of modern European dialects and are best known in the work of Gillieron and his disciples. A systematic discussion of all features of the Thessalian dialect, distinguishing between Aeolic and West Greek elements and noting local variations, is followed by a tabular survey and six linguistic charts.

The determination of the area of each linguistic phenomenon is of course a prerequisite to any objective view of the interrelations of the Greek dialects. Furthermore, Thessalian is one of the dialects of which it is most certain that it is made up of two distinct elements and that in the results of the mixture there is a broad regional differentiation within the dialect, as was brought out most forcibly by Solmsen's well-known article.¹ Hence it furnishes one of the most attractive fields for a study of this kind. On the other hand, here, as elsewhere, one is painfully conscious of the limitations imposed by the material available, as compared to a study of extant speech, in which the observations may represent all localities of a given area and also be of virtually uniform date. In the case of an ancient Greek dialect, one has the difficult task of distinguishing, on the basis of inscriptions from relatively few localities and these of different dates, between local and chronological variations, and again between what is native and what is due to external influence in the historical period.

The author is well aware of these difficulties, to which indeed he calls attention, and proceeds with caution. Bechtel's confident assumption of a differentiation in the contraction of *αι* is rightly rejected, for *προξενιῶν* and *Γομφιῶν* obviously represent merely the *κονή-ων* in Thessalian spelling.

¹ "Thessaliotis und Pelasgiotis," *Rhein. Mus.*, LVIII, 598 ff.

The differentiation of *oi* in Pelasgiotis, *toi* in Thessaliotis, is also rejected, though wrongly in my opinion.¹ I am skeptical of the view that *ón* = *ἀνά* belongs only to the eastern regions and that *án*- of *ἀνέθηκε*, etc., in inscriptions of Pharsalus represents the West Greek element. Since *ón* is also quotable from Pharsalus, it seems more probable that, like several of the other Aeolic elements, it was once common to all parts of Thessaly, and that the *án*-, though quotable from an earlier period than in Pelasgiotis, is equally due to external influence of the historical period. Cf. Arc. *ἀνέθυσε* beside *ἐνέθυσε*, both in archaic dedications.² The intrusion of a form that is common to the majority of dialects and prevails in literary products must often be recognized for a period preceding that of specific *κοινή* influence. For the *στ* of *ἑλιστάν*, *πεπώσταν* of Larissa the author accepts the view which he attributes to Brugmann,³ but which is rather that of Thumb and has been adequately criticized by Kretschmer.⁴ The author is in agreement with probably all first-hand students of the dialects in believing that the dialect of Phthiotis, from which unfortunately we have so few early inscriptions, was Thessalian and to that extent Aeolic. Beloch's refusal⁵ to admit this, even after the inherent probability was supported by some specific evidence, is explained only by his desire to discredit the Aeolic affinities of the Achaeans and establish them as Dorians.

C. D. BUCK

Aeneas Tacticus, Asclepiodotus, Onasander, with an English Translation by MEMBERS OF THE ILLINOIS GREEK CLUB. London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. Pp. x+532.

This edition is a product of synthetic scholarship. After discussions and translations of portions of the treatise of *Aeneas Tacticus* by members of the Faculty Greek Club of the University of Illinois, the material was re-worked and edited by Professors W. A. Oldfather, A. S. Pease, C. M. Moss, and H. V. Canter. The inclusion of the last two authors is due to the necessity of making the volume conform approximately to the size required for the Loeb Series. The Preface to *Asclepiodotus* is signed by Professors C. H. Oldfather and W. A. Oldfather; that of *Onasander*, by Professors W. A. Oldfather, A. S. Pease, and J. B. Titchener. The help of other members of the University is duly acknowledged. Since members of the Club had served in the United States Army, the book has profited by first-hand acquaintance with things military.

I am glad to see that the Loeb Library is to include books that are purely informational, and that it is now reaching authors whose works belong—to use a distinction of De Quincey's—to the literature of knowledge rather than to the literature of power. The writers included in this volume have been but

¹ *C.P.*, XVII, 86, on *IG* ix. 2. 241; the author still prefers to take *TOI* as dative singular.

² *IG* v. 2. 554, 555.

⁴ *Glotta*, VI, 295.

³ Brugmann-Thumb, p. 411.

⁵ *Griech. Gesch.* i. 2. 89.

little more than names even to classical scholars, a situation that may be ascribed in some measure to the fact that no inviting edition has hitherto been in existence.

From the nature of the subject of this volume, it is destined, I believe, to make its appeal to the scholar rather than to the general or gentle reader. For this reason I rather regret that the translators were not allowed for annotation and illustration about half as much space as was permitted to Frazer for his invaluable edition of Apollodorus in the same series. Effective use has been made, however, of the limited space allotted to notes.

We read military annals in the same superficial fashion in which we watch a football game, where we keep our eyes on the man with the ball, and are entirely oblivious of the many things necessary to render possible the advance of the runner. The things to which history ascribes success in battle are often as superficial as those to which the grandstands attribute victory on the gridiron. We have books telling us how to watch a football game; this volume, along with the manual of Vegetius, permits us to see some of the inside workings of the game of war.

The book appears opportunely. There has never been a time when the classicist could discuss ancient warfare with greater understanding. We have lived through the long years of the world-war. We have seen the motives and methods of armies and nations. The few extant ancient treatises on warfare show that the ancients displayed the same mental alertness to gain advantages and that their efforts suffer by comparison chiefly because of their limited populations and industrial resources. I do not see how a person can possibly read about or teach the Hannibalic war, for instance, in the same manner he did a decade ago.

There can be no doubt that Aeneas was well versed in military matters. There is an atmosphere of assurance and authority about his treatise. The pages of Greek and Latin writers show that the best generals were doing continually things advocated by him. He is really a *locus classicus* on methods of issuing commands and of conveying secret military information.

Although the work of Aeneas was not written from the point of view of a non-combatant, I know of no clearer ancient picture of the effect of war on Mr. Commonpeople. Anyone who has spent two war-years in Europe can invest with a colorful atmosphere the requirements for passports and *permis de séjour* (p. 55). Many aspects of ancient warfare affected the civilian population just as they do today. An impressive list of them has been made by the translators on page 12: "censorship of letters, police prohibition of gatherings, putting out of lights, passports, exclusion or internment of suspicious aliens, special regulations for the surveillance of lodging-houses, interest moratoria and supertaxes on wealth, bonuses for importers of food and munitions. . . ."

Asclepiodotus was the least penetrating of the three authors; his treatment is colorless. Along with Aelian and Arrian he is important, however, in giving details of organization and drill. Without these authors it would be difficult to reconstruct satisfactorily a picture of Greek drill-grounds and

Greek military evolutions. It is almost impossible to translate passages on these subjects without a practical knowledge of drilling. Here especially the book is going to prove convenient for quick reference.

Onasander was obviously a scholar who used military annals to reconstruct his principles of generalship in much the same way a modern investigator would do, but of course he had the advantage of fuller material. Dozens of his statements might, however, still be copiously illustrated from ancient records. He is only one of many authors who show us that the ancients understood thoroughly the psychology of noise and spick-and-spanness (see pp. 470-71). Soldiers regularly made a din, both vocal and instrumental, when entering battle. Vegetius (ii. 14) says that "furbished armor arouses in the enemy the utmost terror." The Romans themselves had to be warned that flashing gold and silver neither protected nor injured (Tac. *Agr.* 32). In an address before an engagement with the richly caparisoned Samnites, Papirius Cursor reminded his men that crests did not inflict wounds (Livy x. 39. 12). I read in a popular book by a combatant in the Great War that in the early days of the conflict soldiers were ordered as an aid to concealment to refrain from polishing their brass buttons. This resulted in such a lowering of morale that the order was rescinded.

To select but one other passage for illustration, Onasander (chap. xii) stresses the need of having an army breakfast early when in the vicinity of the enemy. At the Trebia, Hannibal managed to lure the Romans to battle without breakfast (Polyb. iii. 71-72), while in an engagement with Hasdrubal (son of Gisco) in Spain, Scipio forced the Carthaginians to labor under the same disadvantage (*ibid.* xi. 22).

In the section on Onasander it would have been advisable, I believe, to translate *φάλαγξ* by "legion" instead of by "phalanx." The text is Greek, but the work is based primarily on Roman experience (see p. 372).

With this edition Onasander becomes triune, since an *a* is added to the *o* and the *e* that have hitherto appeared in the antepenult. As the name has not been in frequent or common use, I see no reason why we should not adopt the "reformed spelling," which is the Doric form of the best manuscript (see p. 347). The situation is not exactly similar to that of the great Latin epic poet in whose case usage by generations of English scholars and cultured people in general has made the spelling "Virgil" correct.

The translation of this author is going to prove invaluable to the Greekless historian destined to fill in a lacuna in military books by writing a history of the art of command.

The volume should be familiar (1) to teachers giving instruction in authors having to do with military campaigns; (2) to classical investigators wishing a handy, reliable text and translation; and (3) to students of the history of warfare, some of whom have regretted in my hearing the lack of translations of these and a few other ancient military writers. It represents thoughtful, deliberate scholarship. Since there are no other English translations, it is a contribution to classical learning in a way to which few other volumes of the series will be able to lay claim.

EUGENE S. MCCARTNEY

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The Roman Toga. By LILLIAN M. WILSON. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins Press, 1924, Pp. 132.

Some years ago the present writer desired to dress several students in togas in order to represent a Roman religious ceremony. After exhausting the literature on the subject in various dictionaries of antiquities and manuals on Roman life from Becker on, and deriving four irreconcilable ideas of its shape, viz., the oval, the elliptical with points, the crescent with attached ellipse, and the circular segment, he cut out roughly semicircular sails (the *ἡμικύκλιον* of Dionysius), draped them in the conventional way, pulled up the first length over the second to form the *umbo*, and, being a mere man, let it go at that. Not so Miss Wilson, whose evident experience in the making of clothes and faculty of intuitive visualization of clothed figures did not permit her to be satisfied or baffled by the conclusions "established" by predecessors. It was an arduous task, thoroughly and successfully accomplished, and the results are worthy of the sumptuous volume with which the Johns Hopkins University ushers in its "Studies in Archaeology."

The author's long study of the toga in sculptures and her experience in reproducing it upon living models have led her to assume eleven distinct forms. The toga of the third century, B.C., approximately a rectangle twice as long as wide and with its two lower corners much rounded, expands in size during the next two centuries but maintains about the same shape. At the beginning of the Empire, as illustrated by the *Ara Pacis*, it has added an isosceles trapezoid to its upper side which, folding over, becomes the *sinus*. In the first two centuries of the Empire this *sinus* becomes almost as wide as the original section, which also greatly expands. Thus practically a double garment is formed, of exceedingly voluminous extent. The resulting mass of folds upon the left shoulder become too cumbersome and are later gathered up into regular bands, which, growing more and more formal, cover both shoulder and arm and require some means of fastening. At the same time the original rounded section diminishes in length and hangs on the wearer farther from the ground. A radical departure is made when a segment of the *sinus* is cut out, thereby enabling the bands to be made long enough to cover breast and shoulder and to wind around the body under one arm. The toga continues to shrink in both the *sinus* and the original section while the bands develop into a long, rectangular tail-piece for winding about both shoulder and breast as illustrated by the statue of the magistrate of the fourth century, now in the Palazzo dei Conservatori. On the consular diptychs of the fifth and sixth centuries this narrow rectangular strip continues and is used to give the effect of a broad collar, but the toga proper has shrunk to a small fraction of its former size and is in shape utterly unlike any of its predecessors.

A number of acute and interesting observations are to be found incidental to the main discussion. The border on the lower edge of the Arringatore statue was made during the weaving. The faint stripes on the same statue suggest

that this may be the puzzling *trabea*. The vertical edge of the toga as it hung between the feet is often folded over, and the curving line shows that the upper edge of the toga of the late Republic was not straight. A figure on the *Ara Pacis* relief shows that togas were held in place, possibly by safety pins. Aesthetic considerations and the evidence from a wall-painting support the belief that the border of the *praetexta* was on the curve (or diagonals) of the *sinus*, and actual experiments prove that this could be done in the process of weaving. The loops appearing at the lower corners indicate that the togas had seams, and hence were probably made of two pieces. The obscure *forcipes* which Tertullian mentions are conjecturally identified with clamps encircling the heavy broad folds represented on the breast in many statues on the evidence of stripes visible on these folds.

The reviewer, however, is not convinced, despite the ingenious argument on pages 57-60, that the double garment worn by the flamen in Figure 17D is not the *laena*. Cicero's statement on its face means nothing more than that Popilius, as flamen, was sacrificing clothed in the *laena*, while Servius does not say that this was a brooch-fastened garment, but that flamens sacrificed in it, using brooches (*infibulati*). These passages are not proof that the *laena* was used only in sacrifices. Moreover, the lack of a brooch on the figure referred to is not sufficient to justify the assumption of a double toga, of which we hear nothing from other sources, and the consequent imputation of error to Servius in calling the *laena* a *togam duplicem*.

In the Appendix are given complete measurements of all the toga styles with directions as to materials and methods of making and wearing. The proper shade of Roman purple for the *praetexta*, as ascertained from freshly uncovered wall-paintings in Pompeii, is also given. All this is invaluable for the production of Roman plays and pageants.

The book is well and carefully written. It is naturally difficult to explain the form of any complicated dress like the toga without the aid of a visible demonstration. But the utmost pains have been taken in every case to make form and draping clear to the reader. One or two places, however, might be improved in a later revision. In the fourth sentence of page 48 the words "side" and "uppermost" are ambiguous at first reading and the phrase "next to the page" gives trouble, since the toga has just been conceived as placed "next to the body." On page 53 we read that "the purple stripe (on the tunic) is nearly twice the width of the stripe shown in the garment," but it is not stated whether the width of the tunic stripe is derived from the other figures in this painting or from other sources. In this connection one could wish that Miss Wilson would also investigate the problems of the *tunica laticlavia* and *angusticlavia*. The assertion on page 20 that "these changes (in the toga) can hardly be said to constitute a development" is scarcely intelligible, especially in view of the sentence on page 30: "Each succeeding form of the toga was developed from the preceding form, which is the general rule in the evolution of all garments."

The crowning merit of this study is, of course, the many diagrams and large, clear photographs not only of all the toga forms but of the process of draping them. The author takes nothing for granted but by parallel photographs of sculptures and togated models she shows the actual correspondence of the shapes she has worked out to their ancient counterparts. The similarity is striking in all cases except possibly Figures 55A and 67. Because of this thoroughness and sound method *The Roman Toga* seems destined to supersede all other treatments of this long-baffling dress.

HAROLD L. AXTELL

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

Studies in Herodotus. By JOSEPH WELLS. London: Basil Blackwell, 1923.

Of these eleven papers four are new and the others, two of which are reprinted from the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, have been written during the last thirty years, but revised in the past year. (1) "The Account of the Colonization of Ionia in Herodotus" maintains with constant reference to Curtius, Wilamowitz, Meyer, and Bury that tradition is right in bringing the Ionians into Asia Minor from European Greece and connecting them especially with Attica and with the disturbances caused by the Dorian migration. (2) "Who Was Gyges?" argues that he was not a Lydian at all, but a Cimmerian invader. (3) "Peloponnesian History to 550 B.C." is a useful summary and discussion of recent opinion on such questions as early Spartan culture, Lysurgus, the chronology of Pheidon, who is assigned to the eighth century, the date of the Messenian wars, the settlement of Thera (Herodotus' story may be true and modern reconstructions are mutually destructive), and some notes on the Cypselidae. (4) "The Chronology of the Reign of Cleomenes I" is reprinted from the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Volume XXV (1905). (5) "The Persian Friends of Herodotus" (also from the *JHS*) conjectures that his chief informant may have been Zopyrus (Herodotus iii.160). (6) deals with Miltiades, son of Cimon, and (7) with Cimon, the son of Miltiades. The eighth, "Recent Criticism on the Persian Wars," with the aid of Grundy, and Goodwin on the battle of Salamis, defends Herodotus against the criticism of Delbrück, Meyer, Obst, Nitzsch, and Bury. The Persian army was as much larger than Delbrück's figures as it was smaller than Herodotus'. Herodotus perhaps confused commanders of 10,000 and those of 60,000 and so got 1,800,000 instead of 3,000,000. There is no evidence that Herodotus wrote as a Periclean, which indeed is impossible if the last three books were written first and finished by 450. Modern a priori reconstructions of the campaign of Plataea to the discredit of Athens are baseless. (9) "Aristophanes and Herodotus" discusses the obvious possible allusions to and parodies of the historian in the comedian. (10) "Herodotus and the Intellectual Life of the Age" argues, partly against Nestle, that Herodotus' culture and reading were mainly pre-Periclean, and

gives a good summary of some of his leading ideas. (11) "Herodotus in English Literature" is a readable, but by no means exhaustive discussion of the translations of Herodotus and the references to him in the literature of England.

Mr. Wells, joint author with Mr. W. W. Howe of an edition of Herodotus (cf. *Class. Phil.*, IX, 212), is evidently familiar with his author and the literature of the subject. His general tendency, as our summaries have shown, is to support the tradition and distrust over ingenious reconstructions of history. Characteristic is the remark directed against the application of the "one source" method to Plutarch: "This is not a priori probable and will hardly be accepted by those who have had an Oxford tutor's experience of the way in which men compile essays from very different sources." An apologist for the method might reply that Plutarch did not have access to the Bodleian. To which the rejoinder would be that he lightly remarks "I need not quote the passage for the third book of Chrysippus on Justice is to be found everywhere."

PAUL SHOREY

Cicero, de Senectute, de Amicitia, de Divinatione, with an English translation by WILLIAM ARMISTEAD FALCONER. Loeb Classical Library. 16mo. New York: Putnam, 1923. \$2.50.

This number in the Loeb Classical Library is unique in more ways than one. Most, if not all, of the other volumes in the series are the work of men and women who are classical scholars by profession. This edition and translation of three of the most popular of Cicero's essays we owe to a jurist, recently judge in the Tenth Chancery Circuit Court of Arkansas.

We often complain that American business and professional men do not have time for nor interest in classical literature and classical studies, as our British cousins do. Here is a brilliant exception to the general rule—a circuit judge who has had to move about much in the performance of his judicial duties and who, while traveling on trains or sitting in Arkansas hotels, has redeemed the time with Cicero's philosophy of life, and has given us an admirable translation of some of Tully's best interpretations of Greek philosophy.

Though the editor explains that his Latin, long neglected, had grown rusty, he need not apologize; for he translates with all the skill of the literary artist and all the accuracy of the Latin professor. Only rarely does some minute point escape him—the "ad" in *addiscentem* and "e" in *elaborari* (pp. 34-35; 62-63), e.g., or *eum* (pp. 18-19).

Actual mistranslations do not occur, unless it be commune as "generally" (pp. 44-45), where one should perhaps translate it "a weakness common also to ill health"; *fortis equus* is a "race-horse" rather than a "brave horse" (pp. 22-23); "rape" is surely too strong for *stupra* (pp. 48-49); *tristius curantur* should mean not "they are cured with greater difficulty," but "their treatment

is severer"; and *invidi* seems to be "ill will" rather than "envy" (pp. 122-23). But these may be questions of taste in the choice of words, not of accuracy of rendering, and only praise is due to the author for his scholarly and artistic contribution to the Library.

All three essays, as rendered by Judge Falconer, are pieces of admirable translation—accurate and true to the original, idiomatic in the use of English, felicitous in the choice of words. Of the three, however, the essay on "Old Age," as a first labor of love, is easily the best.

WALTER MILLER

Homer. The Iliad. With an English translation by A. T. MURRAY.
Vol. I. Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann.
New York: G. P. Putman's Sons, 1924. Pp. xviii+579.

Murray's third volume of the Loeb Homer, containing the first twelve books of the *Iliad*, is like the first two in aim and execution. The text is the vulgate. Three-fourths of the footnotes, which altogether average about one to each page of text, give variant readings or indicate the verses rejected by ancient critics or not found in the best MSS. The rest of the notes contain variant interpretations of moot passages, or a helpful exegesis or comment. In the Bibliography one misses Finsler's *Homer* (2d. ed., in two parts, 1914, 1918), a work of far greater assistance to most of those for whom the Loeb series is intended than are many of the books which Murray mentions. The translation in tone and sometimes in language is like that of the Leaf and Lang version. Murray's is perhaps a little closer to the Greek, and therefore a little farther from the English; but this is right for a bilingual edition of Homer.

A remark of Tennyson's about translating Homer has been recently published: "To translate Homer would be the work of a lifetime; and when done the benefit of it rests with the translator. "Neither of these conclusions holds true of Professor Murray's work. And yet it is interesting to notice the influence of the Homeric poems upon the translator's critical views as his work has progressed. In the Introduction to the present volume Murray gives with far greater conviction and finality than in the Preface to his first volume of the *Odyssey* his belief in the lack of foundation and therefore in the valuelessness of the conclusions of modern destructive criticism of the Homeric poems. These few pages formulate one of the best extant *credos* of the Homeric unitarian. It is only another illustration of the fact that the unanswerable argument against the modern disintegrators is the *probare legendo*.

In estimating the value of the present work one thinks of Professor Shorey's *dictum*: "There is but one way to recover the lost capacity to appreciate a great poet of the older world, to read him, if it may be, with the com-

petent, sympathetic, and not too heavy-handed guidance of one who knows and loves and understands."¹ Professor Murray has given us just that guidance.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

SAMUEL E. BASSETT

Die Homerischen Gleichnisse. By HERMANN FRÄNKEL. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921. Pp. v+119.

This study of the contents and application of the Homeric similes is in three parts. The first (pp. 1-16) is largely polemic directed against laying too much emphasis either on the "point of comparison" or on the use of the simile to suggest the mood and atmosphere of the action. The second (pp. 16-97) is a minute study of all the Homeric similes and many related metaphors, classified according to theme. The third part (pp. 97-114) gives the author's conclusions about the uses, sources, and development of the similes.

The weakness of the work lies in the unconvincing nature of two assumptions on which it is based. The first is that a sufficiently careful and unprejudiced examination of each simile will show what was in the poet's mind, or at least what was the effect upon the listener. Fränkel tries to determine to what extent each simile is "glued" (to use an expression of Eustathius) to the narrative. For example, when the dust raised by the advancing Achaean army is compared to a thick mist (Γ 10 ff.), Fränkel suggests (p. 23) that the poet in referring to the anxiety of the shepherd and the joy of the sheep-stealer is thinking of the Achaean leaders (ποιμένες λαῶν) and of the enemy (=the thief).

The second assumption, which springs from the Teutonic love of the quest after the undiscoverable *ursprünglich*, is that the comparative age of a simile can be determined from the frequency with which its theme recurs and the degree to which the variations are elaborated. The author reconstructs as it were the family tree of the "older" similes, but assigns the isolated comparisons, e.g., v 25 ff., to the invention of the poet. These two assumptions exclude from sufficient consideration both the wide-roving fancy of any great poet and the frequency with which similar situations, suggesting similar illustrations, are described in the Homeric poems.

Theoretically, the chief contribution of the author is the conclusion that the purpose of the simile is not one but many; practically, the main body of the monograph (pp. 16-97) is a useful commentary on a considerable portion of Homeric text, including many difficult passages. An Index makes this readily available for reference.

SAMUEL E. BASSETT

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

¹ *Class. Phil.*, XVII, 259.

Das hellenische Thessalien: landeskundliche und geschichtliche Beschreibung Thessaliens in der hellenischen und römischen Zeit. Von DR. FRIEDRICH STÄHLIN. Stuttgart: J. Engelhorn's Nachf., 1924. Pp. xxiv+225.

This volume is, as it is intended to be, a veritable mine of information on Thessaly, geographical, historical, archaeological, geological, bibliographical. Almost anything that you wish to know of Thessaly or of any place in Thessaly can be found here, or at least a reference to the works of others who discuss it. An excellent map, twelve plates from photographs, and twenty-nine figures from line-drawings accompany the text. Among the interesting places dealt with are Ossa, Pelion, Tempe, Demetrias, Pharsalos, Tricca, Thermopylae; for Dr. Stählin includes, with the four tetrads of Thessaly proper, Perrhaebia, Magnesia, Dolopia, Othrys, and the Sperchius Valley. The work is the fruit of journeys to Thessaly in 1904 and 1912, and of years of study of the ancient sources and of the modern literature on the country; its crowded pages testify to even super-Teutonic industry.

The author stops his account with the close of the Roman period, and there is but incidental mention of the monasteries of Meteora, although modern Larissa is honored with a detailed map; perhaps the latter was inserted to elucidate the highways to other parts of the country, which must have been anciently much as they are now. It is worth noting by others than specialists that Demetrias, which was founded by Demetrius Poliorcetes and became one of the three "fetters of Greece," lay not on the great hill of Goritza, east of Volo, but at Pagasae, to the southwest of Volo, on a very slight elevation close by the water's edge, a location seemingly without the military strength which Demetrius evidently had. The literature on this point and the complete demonstration are all given by Dr. Stählin.

ROLAND G. KENT

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

-
n
t.

n
l.
s-
ne
es
y-
e-
ne
ne
es

d
l-
to
en
ts
ne
st
on
th
n-